THE CLASS OF WHICH THE AUTHOR WAS A MEMBER IN THE PRAIRIE CHURCH OF HIS BOYHOOD

"Every child in the neighborhood had instruction in the Bible. And I am thinking that what existed there in that primitive community should, for the integrity of our life, be made possible under the changed and heterogeneous social conditions which now obtain."

The Debt Eternal

By John H. Finley 1863–
Formerly Commissioner of Education and President
of the University of the State of New York;
Author of "A Pilgrim in Palestine"

The eternal debt of maturity
to childhood and youth

Published jointly by
COUNCIL OF WOMEN FOR HOME MISSIONS
and
MISSIONARY EDUCATION MOVEMENT OF THE
UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Printed in the United States of America

A "partial payment" of the debt under which I have been placed by the church of my fathers, by my Sunday-school teacher in the little church that I knew best, and above all by the prairie pioneer mother with whom I learned to read the Bible.

Contents

Acknowledgment

This book has been prepared with the assistance of Mrs. Helen Dwight Fisher and Mr. Raymond G. Fuller who have gathered its substance and helped to put it in form. Mr. Fuller has also read the proofs which have arrived just on the eve of my departure for Europe. I am furthermore indebted to Dr. Arthur D. Dean of Teachers College, Columbia University, who has read the manuscript and given valuable counsel in the final preparation of the copy for the press.

JOHN H. FINLEY

The Debt Eternal

I

The Debt Eternal

During the Great War, in its very blackest period, I crossed the ocean on my way to Palestine. The battle of Kemmel Hill occurred when I was on shipboard. Marshal Haig, on the other side of the Channel, was saying to his men that they were standing with their backs to the wall. Conditions were desperate. And yet it was at that very time that the head of the Education Department in England was introducing a parliamentary measure which came to be known as the "Children's Charter," and that he was rising in the House of Commons in its behalf, crying even above the sound of the guns and of Marshal Haig's appeal, "Education is the eternal debt which maturity owes to children and youth."

So in the midst of discussions of reparations and debts which fill the papers and books with statistics of what peoples owe one another, and incidentally fill their heads with suspicion, distrust and hate, we have need to remember that the supreme debt under which we have been placed by our past, by our hope for the future of the race, by our faith in a Divine Being and by our belief in the Christ in whom He has been revealed to men, is to teach our children that which has been committed to us through centuries and to enable them, so far as that is humanly possible, to realize that which we have struggled toward in our best moments and in our highest aspirations and our most unselfish deeds.

So I have called this book "The Debt Eternal." It is to help us to feel that responsibility to those who come immediately and even remotely after us, and then to suggest ways in which that responsibility can be met through the home, the school, the church and other institutions and agencies of our Christian civilization.

And think how the responsibility crowds upon us. The world has been thousands of millions of years in the making and man has been upon it for tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of years. The mouths of the billions who have gone before are stopped with dust. It is only through us, the living, and such of their thoughts and memories of their deeds as are kept in books and in music and in pictures, that all that racial experience of these hundreds of thousands of years is transmitted, and it is only as we make child character and child intelligence and child bodies capable of carrying on toward the ideals set before mankind in the teachings of Christ, that we confidently hope for the "saving of America" and of the world.

First of all, let us think of what our heritage is, the heritage of faith which has come down to us through many centuries. We usually begin the record with the eleventh chapter of *Hebrews,* which is a recital of the phenomena of the faith of the patriarchs and prophets and warriors, among the first of whom was Abraham —whom I heard Dr. Gunsaulus once speak of as "the first American" because he "went out (westward) not knowing whither he went." That immortal list of men and women included the names and the particular evidences of the faith of Jacob and Moses and Joshua; the names of some of whose deeds time failed the writer of the

letter to speak; Gideon and Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David and Samuel; and the evidences of the faith of unnumbered martyrs whose names are not given. It is a chapter of disappointments, for though they all obtained a "good report," they received not the promise, that is, they did not reach their ideal state. It was only through those coming after them that they were to be "made perfect."

That list was written nearly two thousand years ago. It was but suggestive even for that time. It did not include, for example, the names of the first disciples and the apostles. But the writer was conscious that he and they to whom he was writing were compassed about by a greater cloud of witnesses than those he mentioned. It is that company, multiplied by hundreds of thousands, that now look down upon us to see what we are going to do to realize the ideal set before us by one who is the "Author and Finisher of our faith." I once heard Dr. Fosdick say in a sermon that we had to count our direct ancestors back through but thirty generations to find that we had each a billion. They converge upon us, they reside within us, they remind us of the land for which they set out but never reached. What else is this urge within us but a Divinity impelling us toward a goal that is beyond our sight, a goal that science has not seen with its microscope or its telescope, a goal that we can see only by a faith and reach as a nation and as a race only by keeping that faith burning in the hearts of those who carry on when our living here is ended?

If I were adding new examples of faith and new names to the memorable list in the letter to the Hebrews, I should have to give up the whole of the book to our

heritage. But space fails me, as time failed the author of that ancient epistle of faith, to speak of those who have gone before us in later generations, confessed "strangers and pilgrims on the earth" who, though they also obtained a good report, received not the promise.

I cite my own personal experience and debt, which is, I am sure, suggestive and illustrative of the great generic debt under which those sojourners from one eternity to another across this earth here in America, to go no farther back, have placed us.

When I was emerging from the indistinctness of the past eternity into what I am accustomed to call my "life," (and it seems as if it were contemporaneous with the Homeric days of the race), I can see a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian, who was accustomed to start the hymns of a Sunday in the prairie-church, sitting at night, with closed eyes, in a small, lighted room, the only one in a square mile of darkness out on the prairie, and I can still hear him singing a quaint song, which has now disappeared, I think, from our hymnology:

> I'm a pilgrim, and I'm a stranger;
> I can tarry, I can tarry but a night.
> Do not detain me, for I am going
> To where the fountains are ever flowing.
> I'm a pilgrim, and I'm a stranger;
> I can tarry, I can tarry but a night.

He had come as a young man from a little church on the western slopes of the Alleghenies, a church established by his grandfather, who was my great-great grandfather, in a Presbytery reaching from the ridges of the "Laurel Hills to the setting sun"; and he went on, sing-

ing in the dawn, toward the west—one of the society of frontier Scotch-Irish migrants, who as President Roosevelt has said, were as the spray of the immigration that broke over the Alleghenies, precursors, pilgrims, whose companions in that wandering exile were the clouds, the migratory birds, the swarming bees, the frogs, the devouring grasshoppers, the seventeen-year locusts and those lean large-familied brothers of the pioneer, whose covered wagons like white-sailed schooners were ever moving across the level stretches of plain.

I can even now hear (accompanying the tune of that pioneer's confident faith in a celestial destination or predestination) the cry of the cranes in their honking migration northward, the lonesome croak of the frogs, (as Aristophanes heard them in the ponds of Greece), and the shrill cry of the bloodless grasshoppers, to whom Homer likened Old Priam's chiefs upon the walls of Troy. I can even hear the invisible choir of bees which one day came singing in the sky over my field and were persuaded down to temporary industry on the earth by the clods I, as a ploughboy, threw up into the air.

For the whole creation seemed to give accompaniment to the song of the faith of those who "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," and that they desired "a better country, that is, an heavenly."

There was a sense of the "illimitable destiny," of the "challenge of eternity," even among those pioneer, God-fearing farmers and farmers' wives who lived austerely and busily, yet calmly, and as in the presence of immortal forces. Outwardly, the life seemed a hard life, a gray life, a narrow life. No one actually traveled far, except to go back to one's native place or to search for new

fields beyond. But there was a consciousness of the splashing fountains beyond time and space.

These migrants (for they were not vagrants, they were destinated travelers) built their houses of wood, from sheer necessity; but these ephemeral structures, even, seemed to express their sense of the transitoriness of their terrestrial life. And the acre of virgin land which they set apart for the church was as the threshing-floor of Ornan, the Jebusite, or the plot of Obed-Edom in whose house the ark rested on its journey,—as a Bethel, a very gate of heaven, on a stoneless, treel plain.

I should think that I was imagining and imputin too much of other-worldliness to those whose seeming cheerless lives sat often at such gates of heaven if I had not the testimony of others to add to my own experience. I read some time ago a notable article in *The Atlantic,* entitled "Whither?", which reveals in letters gathered from a generation or two ago (though in another part of the United States, as I assume) what I believe was true in my less cultured community,—reveals "a far deeper life, a profounder hope and faith, a recognition of wider horizons than most of the contemporary world knows" with all its greater geographical horizons.

And I found recently in a diary this entry concerning a sermon which belonged to that period, a sermon preached about the Atlantic cable:

"The two hemispheres are now successfully united by means of the electric wire, but what is it, after all, compared with the instantaneous communication between the Throne of Divine Grace and the heart of man? Offer up your silent petition. It is transmitted through realms

of unmeasured space more rapidly than the lightning's flash, and the answer reaches the soul ere the prayer has died away on the sinner's lips. Yet this telegraph, performing its saving functions ever since Christ died for men on Calvary, fills not the world with exultation and shouts of gladness, with illuminations and bonfires and the booming of cannon. The reason is, one is the telegraph of this world and may produce revolutions on earth [as it has] ; the other is the sweet communication between Christ and the Christian soul and will secure a glorious immortality in Heaven."

The poet Arthur O'Shaughnessy in his poem on St. John the Baptist says:

> I think he had not heard of the far towns,
> Nor of the deeds of men nor of Kings' crowns
> Before the thought of God took hold of him.

I have often wondered if in this age in which the telegraph now reaches around the globe, in which the telephone has made it possible for the President to speak to thousands in New York and San Francisco at the same moment, as he did on the day of the burial of the Unknown Soldier, in which a voice in speech or song may be heard by a million or more by radio, when the noises of the far towns and the deeds of men in remote parts of the earth are heard even in the midst of solitudes, whether we shall be able to keep the thought that took hold of John in the Wilderness or even give it a chance to take hold of us. Our victories over the afar will be of little value to mankind if they shut us away from this communication with the Infinite.

It was at that very time of this Homeric Presbyterian

singing out on the prairies by one whose kinsman had invented the telegraph that there was sung here in the Atlantic seaboard states that crude song, very like a topical melody of more recent days, which ran, as nearly as I can remember:

Far out upon the prairies
How many children dwell
Who never read the Bible
Nor hear the Sabbath bell!
And when the holy morning
Wakes us to sing and pray,
They spend the blessed moments
In idleness and play.

And we prairie children, using an Eastern book, I suppose, sang it, too, never realizing that we were of those whom the song-writer had pityingly in mind.

Fortunately, out on those prairies, though there were few Sabbath bells, the children who dwelt there *did* read the Bible and knew the chief end of man, and if there was aught of Sabbath "idleness or play," it was of a most pious and sober sort. At any rate it was so if I may generalize from the habits of the little community which had that country church which I knew best at its center.

A metropolitan reporter who had an interview with me a little time ago said that when President Wilson many years since made the famous threat of hanging certain people "higher than Haman," he and his fellow reporters had no notion as to who Haman was. But I venture to say that there were few if any of teachable mind and literate age in the pioneer Christian families who were not as familiar with the characters of the

Bible, Haman included, as these reporters were with the men in the street where President Wilson proposed to erect the gallows.

I do not know that it is more culpable, culturally, not to be familiar with the proud Biblical characters whom Dante found in Purgatory (Nimrod, Saul on dewless and rainless Gilboa, Rehoboam and the sons of Sennacherib) than with the alternate classical representatives of Pride whom he found there, Pallas, Mars and others, but I am certain that no human life can well orient itself with respect to these two mysterious eternities between which we journey across this earth unless it have some guidance of the theocratic experience of those whom Nimrod and Saul and Rehoboam represented in Dante's "Divine Comedy" and whom Moses, David and the "cloud of witnesses" illustrated in the immortal chapter on faith, beginning with the definition, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." If I were adding to this chapter later specific illustrations of faith, I think I should also add the later definition of faith given by one who saw men giving their lives beside him in the trenches of France, though it has an un-Biblical flavor. It is Donald Hankey's definition, "Faith is betting your life that there is a God."

The fate that will overtake the individual or the country that has not this reach of human sympathy and this faith has been powerfully presented in an ode by one of our recent American poets containing these lines:

> The world stands out on either side
> No wider than the heart is wide;
> Above the world is stretched the sky,
> No higher than the soul is high.

> The heart can push the sea and land
> Farther away on either hand;
> The soul can split the sky in two,
> And let the face of God shine through.
> But East and West will pinch the heart
> That can not keep them pushed apart;
> And he whose soul is flat—the sky
> Will cave in on him by and by.

If for no other reason than to prevent the pinching of our own hearts, our sympathies should go out daily, east and west, till they encircle the earth; if for no other reason than to prevent the sky caving in on us, we must keep it "split in two" that the face of God may shine through.

So much for an heritage. It has put upon us an obligation, whether we will or not, placing us in debt to those coming after us. It is through the children from generation to generation that we are to come nearer and nearer the goal in this race that is set before us. When I was out in Palestine during the War, I passed one day a squalid village where according to tradition the prophet Jonah was buried. It was one of the cities mentioned in Joshua's division of Canaan. It is only a few miles from Bethlehem and if it had been awake the night that the star came and stood over where the young child was, it might also have seen the glory that shone round about and heard the angelic voices that were listened to by the shepherds. But it has no place in history such as the little town of Bethlehem not more than ten miles away.

When I saw the few children scurrying away as I approached this village, I remembered the disappointing ex-

perience of the old prophet. He did not want to go and do what the Lord had directed him to do. And when, finally, he did go and preach against the great and wicked city of Nineveh, he was impatient and bitter in complaint because the doom that he had prophesied did not come upon the city. Then it was that the Lord asked whether He ought not to save the city in which there were so many scores of thousands who could not tell their right hand from their left hand, that is, innocent children? So the children and the cattle saved the city for the time being.

As we look upon the world to-day we are sometimes disposed to feel as did Jonah about Nineveh. But at the worst or best it is the children through whom, above all others, we are to make it a better world, that is, save it.

And I believe that the children of America are above all others the hope of the world. This is said in no boastful mood. It is said with a sense of the responsibility that is upon those who have had the good fortune to come to this land "trailing clouds of glory" from another world or have come as immigrants by way of some other land. During and since the War I have seen the faces and forms of children all the way back to the traditional Garden of Eden, I have seen their very countenances asking why they were brought into this broken earth where they were compelled to live in misery and pain and hunger, pierced by the winds and snows in Asia Minor, burned on the sands of the Syrian Desert, refugees on the shores of Greece and on the islands of the Ægean, homeless, shelterless, by tens and hundreds of thousands.

It is the very road by which we have come out of

captivity, and we have an obligation to those who are yet back in the old homesteads of the race. But the first obligation is to prepare our own children that they will themselves, not only become the best possible men and women, capable of being the salvation of the America that was committed to us, but also help America to bless this sphere whose people around it share the light of the day with us every twenty-four hours. If we as a people—as fathers and mothers, as teachers, as pastors—do not see in the childhood and youth of America, not only the greatest, most precious asset, but also the means of our saving America and of blessing the world, we shall be as blind and unhappy as Jonah.

The particular field of this study is the home field—America. The first obligation is to teach the child, whether trailing clouds of glory "from God who is our home" directly to a home in America, or coming as an immigrant child by way of some other land, to know the beauty, the grandeur, the miraculous productivity of this land: how the Almighty has prepared its wealth through hundreds if not thousands of millions of years; how the winds keep it swept clean; how the waters drain it; how these same winds bring the clouds to nourish it; and how the seasons in their ceaseless round bring seed-time and harvest. Before the newcomer child of native or immigrant comes to know the history which has given this land its soul, he should come to know and love its wondrous beauty. I think that our physical geographies should not confine themselves to the facts of size and products, of winds and currents and the like, but should add and put first the *beauty* of America—of mountain, river, inland sea, prairie and plain. It would be a

geography in which picture and verse would have place with statistical fact.

I once glanced through a collection of *Poems of Places,* edited by Longfellow, and I found suggestion of material for a physical geography of this sort. Maine, for example, is girded, not as prosaically as the bald definition of its boundaries intimates, but by "bays resplendent as the heaven, starred and gemmed by a thousand isles." Vermont is not merely a state of so many square miles, contiguous to certain other states; it is a "glorious mother" clothed in a "robe of forest green . . . its broidered hem of wild flowers with feathery fern-fronds, light as air, fringing its borders." Massachusetts is described by geographer John G. Whittier as "rough, bleak and hard, scant of soil, with yellow sands that are sands alone, her only mines those of ice and stone, yet on her rock and on her sand and wintry hills, the schoolhouse stands and what her rugged soil denies, the harvest of the mind supplies." Connecticut has not only the things usually mentioned, but according to Fitz-Greene Halleck, "glorious splendors of sunset, cloud, rainbowed beauty of forest leaves,"—with "Health in her gales," in autumn time "Earth has no purer and no lovelier clime." And a fragment of a sentence from Henry James gives a description of towering natural structures, far "above the Bronx" (at West Point), which add more than the towering sky-scrapers to the eternally satisfying assets of the State of New York: "a cluster of promontories, of the lost classic elegance, overhanging vast receding reaches of river, mountain-guarded and dim, which took their place in the geography of the ideal, in the long perspective of the *poetry of association,* rather

than in that of the State of New York." But it is the geography of the *real.* It does belong to the State of New York even if this exile had carried it into the landscape of an *ideal* country. Indeed, the geography of our country is to let us see and possess these glories of promontory, of cañon, and of undrained marsh even. I have a memory of Sidney Lanier's wide sea marshes of the far south with "their braided dusks of the oak and woven shades of the vine"; "beautiful glooms, soft dusks in the noonday fire." And the geographers are the painters and poets and natural scientists, who often see beauties in the places obscure to other eyes or detect the odor of the incense that a flower burns in the wilderness behind the mountains, as the burning bush did for Moses, or now and then musicians who find a "mild September glow and even the clear October blaze" things "to play on the chords of memory with an art of their own." Often I have thought of this transmutation of waves of sight into waves of sound, making a *mighty national song,* to be heard above Plato's *music of the spheres.*

One might travel across the continent finding new wealth of beauty at every step, through the South with Timrod, Lanier, Haynes, and even on the unbroken levels of the prairies of the Middle West and the plains with their silences, as one's geography would show when enriched by a few sentences from Bryant, Platt or John Hay or Hamlin Garland or Mark Twain or James Whitcomb Riley or Eugene Field or Meredith Nicholson or David Grayson or James Lane Allen (whose description of a Kentucky hempfield is worth far more than the year's crop), or Mrs. Catherwood, or Tarkington, or Ade, or from any one of scores of those who know

the heart of America between the two great mountain ranges.

Then, one following the "Oregon Trail" up and on through the mountains, that should be on every horizon, takes on such geographers as Albert Pike, Henry Van Dyke, Bret Harte, Joaquin Miller, E. R. Sill, Bayard Taylor, John Muir; sees the "bright sierras lie a swaying line of snowy white, a fringe of heaven hung in sight against the blue base of the sky"; and finds at last the "glorious dwelling place" of Tamalpais, and the "gilded portal for sailing towards the Island of the Blest."

It is such a land that every home child and every immigrant child should have in its sight, and not alone that rectangle crossed by lines of longitude and latitude (which we later in life find are "imaginary" after all) and dissected into vari-colored blocks of states, whose boundaries seem so hard and conspicuous that we are disappointed in after days that we cross them without a jolt of consciousness. Such a land and alone the enlargement of his little patch of it into a macrocosm of the same features, such a land that the home child and immigrant child will have it not only in his sight but in his *love,* a land "precious in every stone," so dear, as George Woodberry has written, that there's "no little inch of all its broad domain but he would stoop to kiss and end his pain, feeling [its] lips make merry with his own," a land that is indeed, as Katherine Lee Bates has written, "America the Beautiful."

But America is more than the land we live on, the objective land, dear as it is in its association and fair as it is in its inherent beauty. "America" has another con-

notation than a purely geographical one; another content than its physical resource.

It is more than the land we live on, and more than the land we live from—that is, the land from which we get our living—this wonderful land which yields two or three crops of alfalfa out in Colorado, wheat for the world in Minnesota, and satisfying scenery up in New Hampshire; the land which has gold in its veins out in California, silver in Colorado, lead in Missouri, coal in West Virginia, oil in Pennsylvania, and natural gas in Indiana; the land which, like a magician, takes the same elements out of the soil and the sky, and makes an ear of corn in Illinois, a bunch of grapes in western New York, a peach in Delaware, a cranberry in New Jersey and a cotton boll in Georgia; a land which, with slight assistance from synthetic chemistry and horticultural grafting, makes figs to grow on thistles and olive oil to flow from cotton seed and the rarest perfume to rise from coal tar; the land which, stretching from the fields of the Lady of the Snows to the tropic seas, has mobilized the very elements of its soil and in the War commandeered the nitrogen in its atmosphere to fight for the freedom of the world.

The mysteries of this land lie at every door and in every field; they hang over every roof, and hide in every shadow. Mysteries of like sort there are of course in *every* land but with this difference; that *here* every boy and every girl is free to follow them into the presence of the Infinite. That is their heritage of freedom. Neither poverty nor the social obscurity of parents nor the predestinations of autocracy bar the way.

And here, again, should every child who comes upon

this land and every immigrant who comes into it be instructed, not only in the geography of its visible beauty, but in the geography of its marvelous bounty and be made to know what the freedom of his life in America opens to him in the miracles of the fields, the shop and the studio.

These miracles I have with my own eyes seen in nearly every state in this great Union, but I cannot even catalog them here: out on the prairies of Illinois where flowers, fashioned in all the complicated beauty of cultivated orchids, used to grow wild in the virgin soil, till that same soil was made to grow the tall, tasselled corn; in Maryland, where the vendors used to cry their wonderful "Ann Arundel" vegetables beneath student windows; in New Hampshire, where I once saw a sign as if it were written for the whole state, "We make everything that has grit in it"; in Georgia, where I have seen the little cotton boll become, in its varied productivity, the so-called olive oil, cottolene, ginghams, poplins, etc., a cow, a razorback hog, a sheep, a silk-worm, and a dirigible balloon, all wrapped up in the most beautiful package that the Almighty ever tied to the twig of a bush; in California, where the beneficent gods and the giants of the frosts that creep down from the snow-peaked mountains are ever at battle; in New York, where, with the assistance of fertilizer, hot-house and refrigerator, isotherms are banished, all the zones simulated, all soils synthesized, and even the forces of Heaven converted into a sort of panurgic fertility and power.

There is more poetry in such physical geography than in many anthologies, more art than is to be found in

many museums. But a poet is needed to teach this geography of America's bounty as well as that of her beauty.

And there should be other chapters in this America, chapters which would reveal to the imagination and affection of those whom we would have lovers of this land, the beauty and nobility of human lives that have sprung as the flowers or fruits from it, partaking, it would seem sometimes, of the very "tang" of the soil upon which they were born or upon which they have chosen to dwell beyond all other parts of Earth. I take this sequence (first the land itself, then the things it brings forth, and then the human kind) because it was the order of the original creation. The Creator "saw that the earth was good" before he made the creature of his own image that was to live upon it. It is the *human* America that the child and the immigrant must come ultimately to know and to make a part of *his* America, for it is through his America only, as I have intimated, that he is to come to *know* and *love* his world. It is veritably "America first." I should have suspicion of any Frenchman who did not love France, however strong his internationalism. There can be no true internationalism in which there is not a *nation* love to begin with.

I am not ready to say that the sequence of creation is the sequence of the development of the lover of country, but somewhere in this latter sequence must come the *human* associations, for human environment is, after all, associations, not only with the best of those near at hand in time and space, but of all the best that lives or *has* lived between America's wide divided coasts.

And wherever life in its highest heroisms has hallowed

a spot, it should become a place in real America, the conscious possession of the entire people.

I once heard a lecturer try to amuse a New York after-dinner crowd by telling of an experience in the West where he was lecturing on the Mediterranean Sea. Wishing to interest his prairie audience at the very beginning of his lecture, he asked what body of water was in the middle of the earth, and got the response from some awkward boy in the audience, "the Sangamon River," a name which the lecturer pronounced in such a way as to invite a smile from his New York listeners. But the boy was right. The Sangamon River was the middle of the earth, at any rate, the middle of America, for it was near this prairie stream that Lincoln had lived. The "savannas of the Sangamon" of which Bryant wrote, where scarlet tufts glowed in green "like flakes of fire," should be in every youth's and every immigrant's geography—not simply a crooked line upon a map, but the middle stream of Lincoln's land and his.

Most of the millions can visit these holy places only through the transporting facilities of books, though one should make pilgrimages in one's own body when it is possible, and I should be disposed to add, on foot.

But America is more than its beauteous land, more than its miracled products, more than its greatest individual souls, and more than these all together. Above these, as an indefinable perfume, there rises an abstraction "America," for America is a *political* idea, a *moral* purpose, a *prayer* for a better world uttered in the face of the inexorable forces of nature that *seem* hostile only because we do not understand them—uttered in the face

of the stars that seemed to fight with Barak and Deborah of old, and that literally do with America to-day.

This America has had varied definition,—this country which has taken the name with which the entire continent was christened. It has assumed to represent the ideals of the New World, an assumption which obliges its people to be careful not to demean the name "America," a name that really belongs *alike* to people of the United States, Canadians, Mexicans, Brazilians, Argentinians and Patagonians.

How varied the conception of America is, a few illustrative definitions will suggest: a nation "that can only achieve its aims in carrying a *message to mankind* of what has been found possible on this continent"; "a spirit that *hopes grandly* for the race"; a "striving for liberty, justice and truth"; a "land of unlimited opportunity"; or as Emerson defined it, simply "opportunity," whose "entrance doors open to all comers, but whose inner doors are also kept unlocked so that a man may pass from room to room so long as he has strength to open the doors"; the "free commonwealth that comes nearest to the illustration of the *national* equality of all men"; "God's crucible"; "a place to keep alive faith in humanity"; "the only nation in the world that has been built consciously and freely on pure ideals and pure thoughts"; the "concrete expression of that dream of freedom to work that slumbers in every man's soul"; "a country with a part to play in the redemption of humanity and the better organization of the world"; a country in which the "ideal passions of patriotism, of liberty, of loyalty to home and nation, of humanitarianism and missionary effort have all burned with a clear flame"; the "spirit

of a great people in the search for more abundant life."

It is indeed a definition of a country with a cosmic consciousness, a definition gathered from men of widely divergent political and social views—President Butler, Scott Nearing, Zangwill, Bancroft, Steiner and Bergson.

And between these extremes of view lies dimly and perhaps not clearly defined the "America" that lives in the millions who live in the land that we call "America." And, as Mr. Cleveland once said in an address on "The Land We Live In," (an address which he was not able to deliver, but which he read to me), "We need have no fear for the continued healthfulness of the land we live in so long as we are dutifully careful of the land that lives in us."

"The America that lives in us"—that is, the America which the geography of the America we live in should help to define in those to whom we are to give out this precious heritage, the America of to-morrow—is the America, after all, that is our utmost concern, for it is hundred-million-minded America which is to determine in a measure beyond the proportion of the population the future of the world.

It is the divination of the very stars of the flag—those cosmic symbols under which we have been born—that she should come to a world ministry. Through the red clouds that were on her horizon she has ascended with dyed garments to a seat with the other nations where "sweet influences" as of the Pleiades, shall at last be bound together in a league of effective and enduring peace.

But this is to be achieved only by godly and patriotic nurture, beginning in the home and supplemented by the

school both of the children who have been born into this American heritage and those who trail their "gift of glory" across the ocean into it. To these latter we are often as blind as to the "clouds of glory" which our neighbors' children trail across the immortal sea which "brought us hither." No one has done more than the Honorable Franklin K. Lane to help us appreciate these gifts, and nothing more beautiful and discerning has been written of them than this summary which he wrote shortly before he went away from the America to which he, an immigrant, gave such devoted service:

"America is a land of but one people, gathered from many countries. Some came for love of money and some for love of freedom. Whatever the lure that brought us, each has his gift. Irish lad and Scot, Englishman and Dutch, Italian, Greek and French, Spaniard, Slav, Teuton, Norse, Negro—all have come bearing gifts and have laid them on the Altar of America.

"All brought their music. . . . All brought music and their instruments for the making of music, those many children of the harp and lute.

"All brought their poetry, winged tales of man's many passions, folk songs and psalms, ballads of heroes and tunes of the sea, lilting scraps caught from sky and field, or mighty dramas that tell of primal struggles of the profoundest meaning. All brought poetry.

"All brought art, fancies of the mind, woven in wood or wool, silk, stone or metal—rugs and baskets, gates of fine design and modeled gardens, houses and walls, pillars, roofs, windows, statues and painting—all brought their art and hand craft.

"Then, too, each brought some homely thing, some touch of the familiar home field or forest, kitchen or dress—a favorite tree or fruit, an accustomed flower, a style in cookery or in costume—each brought some home-like, familiar thing.

"And all brought hands with which to work.

"And all brought minds that could conceive.

"And all brought hearts filled with home—stout hearts to drive live minds, live minds to direct willing hands.

"These were the gifts they brought.

"Hatred of old-time neighbors, national prejudices and ambitions, traditional fears, set standards of living, graceless intolerance, class rights and the demand of class —these were barred at the gates.

"At the Altar of America we have sworn ourselves to a single loyalty. We have bound ourselves to sacrifice and struggle, to plan and to work for this one land. We have given that we may gain, we have surrendered that we may have victory. We have taken an oath that the world shall have a chance to know how much of good may be gathered from all countries and how solid in its strength, how wise, how fertile in its yield, how lasting and sure is the life of a people who are one, but have come bearing gifts from many countries."

And that purpose so loftily defined must be uttered ultimately in a language in which all can understand one another. The steps by which that purpose is to be realized are these:

First of all, that every immigrant to this land (by whatever way he has come) shall learn the language of the land, whether he come with another language in his

throat or none at all. This may involve going to the homes and teaching the mothers who have not learned it.

Second, that every one of these shall be taught by the best and ablest citizens who can be found for this service what America means in its institutions and its aspirations. Especially is it necessary that we have in our schools as teachers those who know America, who love America whole-heartedly, and who are able to interpret it to those new to it, not as a narrow, self-centered, Ptolemaic America, nor yet as a polyglot, many-minded, soft-hearted, nebulous America, but as an *America of one speech,* of self-respecting personality, of clear national purpose and yet of effective "all-man" Copernican knowledge and sympathy.

Third, that the glory of the gifts of those who come shall not be allowed to "fade into the common light of day," (either for the child or the immigrant), but that all who for days "traveled farther from the East" with a "vision splendid" of this land shall still be "on their way attended" by that vision.

Fourth, that everyone shall have his spiritual inheritance and see America (as Abraham saw the land of Canaan) as a land of promise, but a land in which all shall confess themselves as strangers and pilgrims on this earth, "desiring [as Abraham] a better country, that is, an heavenly."

II

The Child at Home

The greatest child welfare agency in the world is the family home, and the greatest child welfare workers in the world are, or should be, the mother and father. When President Roosevelt opened the White House Conference on the care of dependent children in 1909, he said, "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons." And because this is a generally recognized principle followed by workers for children everywhere, it was adopted as a rule of the Conference, and no change in our social or economic life since then has caused us to reject it. The family is still the basic social unit in America, and it is still normal for American children to live in their own homes under the care of their own parents. The only other system of child-care that we know is the institutional one, exemplified in its extreme in the communistic idea of the nationalization of children, now being tried to a certain extent in Russia. But in America such a social theory and such a practice are hostile to the fundamental principles on which our institutions stand. Even the Pilgrim Fathers who, for a little, practised communism in land and produce, maintained family integrity and individual moral responsibility. We still believe in the home and we still believe that home life and home care give to a child something that no other life or care can give.

The View of Sociologists and Social Workers

Sociologists and thoughtful social workers in America seem to be agreed on this point. Indeed, the whole technique of modern social work is colored by this view of the home. When because of neglect, dependency, cruelty or delinquency, a juvenile court finds it necessary to remove a child from his home, the aim of the court is to return the child just as soon as the home has been rehabilitated. When a child is orphaned and it becomes necessary to place him in an institution, this is now regarded as purely temporary, a mere stepping-stone to the finding of a suitable private home for that child. And even in the case of a child who is mentally defective, and so removed to an institution, the hope is that the child may be so trained and developed as to be able to take a place again in his home and in the community.

The family is and must be the primary social unit and primary child welfare agency, and all other social institutions, such as the church, the school, the community health service, are secondary and supplementary. Mary E. Richmond who has had, and who speaks from, as varied and wide an experience as any social worker in America says, in *What is Social Case Work?*, that not only is the home the primary child welfare agency, but children apparently do not thrive so well under any other care as with their parents. More than that, she believes that so fundamental is the place of the home in our social scheme and so far-reaching its influence, that "all the larger adjustments of industry, finance, international relations, government itself, could be tested in the long run by their effect upon family life; that they must conform

finally to the needs of the home or else be scrapped or reorganized. . . . If, for instance, the railroad trainman cannot see his children often enough really to know them or for them to know him; if it be true that long working hours, or low wages, or sudden transfers of large bodies of workmen to distant points are destructive of a sound family life, then industry itself cannot fail to be crippled by the inevitable reaction against such social blindness, and a reorganization of industry becomes inevitable if civilization is to survive." In fact, all our modern social literature is permeated with this idea of the paramount importance of the home in our social fabric, and of its supreme and inevitable influence in child development.

Relation of the Home to Outside Agencies

This reiteration of what seems to be an obvious fact might easily lead one to suspect that the American home is falling into decay or at least that we are given lately to forgetting its importance. But if there has been or is any forgetfulness of the unique and essential place of the home in our Christian civilization, it is not because the home has ceased to be as vital a factor, but because we have developed so many useful outside agencies, as, perhaps, to obscure our view of the home. Yet every one of these agencies should be considered as secondary and supplementary. The case is well put in *Rural Child Welfare,* published in 1921 by the National Child Labor Committee:

"The home is the most fundamental of all institutions. Society has created family life in the home for the perpetuation of the race. Therefore, since it is into the home that children are born, the responsibility of pro-

viding for their health, education, recreation, care, food, comfort, clothing and shelter rests upon the home, but *only through agreement by the majority of families.* It is only by virtue of that agreement that the state or community has any power whatever."

Social effort should be directed toward helping every home to meet its responsibility rather than taking it away from the home.

So long as real Christian homes exist, nothing can supplant them. As soon as a child is born into a home—even before he is born—he is subject to its influence. And so sensitive is the child, as a growing organism, to even the smallest influence around him that the character of home life and home conditions, whether we want them to or not, color very largely his health, his intelligence, his mental habits, his morals, his ethics, his religious disposition, his whole equipment for the world. Comenius, the father of modern pedagogy, said, "Whatever first attaches itself to the tender age of children, whether good or bad, remains most firmly fixed, so that throughout life it may not be expelled by any after expression," and the modern psychologists who tell us that most of our adult maladjustments find their origin in childhood experiences are merely repeating the same thing in another way.

The effects of home environment on the child are far from simple, and while we could multiply and amplify illustrations of the pernicious effect of an unwholesome one or the beneficent influence of a good home, the lesson is obvious. Whether the home realizes its influence or not, the influence is there, for the home is the child's first and closest environment and it is in the nature of

every growing thing to react instantly and inevitably to its environment, at any rate until it is able to conquer its environment and make that environment assist its development, for I am not willing to accept the definition that education is in all its stages an adapting of the individual to his environment. Education is progressively an adaptation of the environment to the individual. The story of the chameleon which successfully turned from one color to another when the blue cloth and the green cloth and the red cloth were put beside it but expired in trying to match all the colors of a Scotch plaid illustrates what does actually happen to a human being morally in attempting merely to adapt himself to his daily environment. His education should help to develop and strengthen a spirit that will overcome even a vicious environment. But the child in its weakness and ignorance must have an environment which will not destroy the body or spirit before it can develop that power. And biologists are generally agreed that it is environment rather than heredity that is initially determinative. This puts more responsibility upon the home in the present and gives more hope of release from a vicious lineage.

There can be no doubt, however, that in our complex social organization it is very easy for the home to try to shift some of its responsibilities, or to encourage outside agencies to try to assimilate those responsibilities. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise says in *Child vs. Parent:* "False is the charge that school and church fail to coöperate with the parent. Truer is the suggestion that the church and school have vainly undertaken to do that which the home must largely do. The teacher in church and school may supplement the effort of the parent but cannot and

may not be asked to perform the work of parents." Whether the fault in this situation lies with the parents or with the church and school is an open question. How many parents, feeling that they know little about education, or perhaps finding it "hard to live with their children," pack them off to school with a sense of blessed release from responsibility? How many parents, desiring a moral and religious training for their children and perhaps dimly conscious of a neglect of the development of their own nature on the spiritual side, send their children off to Sunday school, expecting that an outside agency will supply the deficiency of the home and do the work which in reality can never be done anywhere else than in the home? How many parents, having but small knowledge of a child's play needs and again finding it hard to understand him, send him gratefully to a play center, to a church, to a boys' club, or to the boy scouts, and consider the matter settled? And how many churches and schools or health centers or settlements, seeing that the parent is doing a pretty poor job, are all too eager to take over the child rather than bother to educate the parent? Fortunately, by no means all. But it is the shortcomings of parental service that justify all child welfare work, whose final purpose must be to train both children and parents so that the shortcomings will no longer exist; and it is the failure of both parents and outside agencies to achieve the true relationship between outside child welfare and the home that creates the apparent usurpation of parental responsibility.

Parent-Teacher Associations and church and community Mothers' Clubs are evidences of the increasing eagerness of American parents to fulfil their responsi-

bilities and of schools and churches to work in close co-operation with the family home. But as Dorothy Canfield Fisher says, there is a tremendous amount of *parent-power* still going to waste in America. "You know well enough that parents, practically all of them, love their children more than anything else. It is the biggest moral force in any community. Canalize that moral force, put it to work where it will do some real good, of lasting and essential importance." *"Parent-power can turn that trick* if you can get hold of it."

There are very real reasons for failures in meeting parental responsibility. The chief of these is, first, ignorance of child needs and, second, economic conditions. This ignorance may take all sorts of forms: ignorance of hygienic laws or ignorance of food values, but the most important and the most prevalent form is ignorance of the mental and spiritual needs of children, of the child's true nature, and of the inevitable laws of his development.

No form of parental ignorance implies simply lack of education in the ordinary sense. Many neglected children live in the homes of the so-called highly educated, and many an uneducated mother has a fine sense of her children's needs. The well-to-do mother who turns her baby over to servants and nurses, because she does not know that a baby needs a mother's companionship and love, comes just as far short of her duty as the poor mother who gives her baby coffee because she does not know that he needs milk. In fact, there is usually more hope in such a case for the poor child and mother than for the rich. Settlement workers, social case-workers, friendly visitors, visiting nurses, visiting teachers, proba-

tion officers and volunteer dispensers of charity all have access to the homes of the poor, and the chances are good that the poor mother will be educated in simple hygienic laws unless she lives in the most isolated regions. But few welfare workers find their way into the homes of the well-to-do. Here education seems to come only through the church, the women's clubs, and to some extent the schools. Probably we should add to this list the magazines, for women's magazines have in the last twenty years done wonderful things in bringing to the attention of the comparatively well-to-do their children's needs.

But children's needs are complex and few parents have any real training in child development or in the art of living with children. There is no doubt that most American parents are deeply anxious for their children's well-being and for their best development, yet, as Dr. William A. White of Washington says, "The relations between parents and children are governed for the most part by crude instinct." Living with children and training them is an art, but as an art it is based on a science which is child psychology. Incomplete as is our knowledge of children, there are certain characteristics that we do know, and behavioristic psychology has gone a long way on the road to explaining them to us. Indeed, if every parent in America could be required to take a course in child psychology or if every church or club in America could give its adult members a course in child psychology, many of our most troublous child welfare problems would be solved, fantastic though the idea seems.

Dr. Healy says, "Of all forms of prevention of delin-

quency I know nothing comparable to the confidences and counsels between elders and children." But "confidences and counsels" presuppose companionship and a true understanding of the child's mind by the elder, for nothing so quickly drives a child into himself as lack of understanding. And how many parents really have that understanding? A mother will almost invariably say, "Why, of course I understand my own child!" But does she? That very mother may be the one who says that her child is so nervous that she *has* to give him his way about what he eats, not at all understanding the causes of his nervousness, or the mental as well as physical significance of right eating habits, or that she is only laying up adult trouble for him by training him to "dominate his environment," as the psychologists say, instead of adapting himself to it. Or she may be the very mother who says that her daughter is so "wilful" that she has to watch her all the time, not realizing that the apparent wilfulness has a source, because all behavior has a source, or that it may be a perversion of an inherent excellent quality, brought about perhaps by the parents themselves by lack of "understanding" and by an overstressing of the prohibitory, coercive method of child care.

"Too often," says Dr. McFie Campbell, "parents have less care for the independent and healthy development of the personality of the child than for the child's conforming to certain of their standards; and this parent often belongs to the solicitous type, apparently most anxious to do everything for the child. It is thus that much of the repression that characterizes the influences surrounding children arises; the parent with his or her own per-

sonal difficulties, sensitiveness, repressions, likes and dislikes, unable or unwilling to see the origin of these, insists on the child's eliminating those reactions which touch the sensitive spots of the parent." But this is not child-training; it is child-distortion. For the old idea that a child is "plastic material to be molded into what shape the parents wish" has, under our new knowledge of the character of the child's mind and spirit, long ago given way among workers with children to the new idea under which, as the Children's Bureau points out, it is the parents' first duty to understand their children's natures and then "to surround them with loving and sympathetic guidance while their development proceeds as nature intended. . . . To reach this understanding of child life, perhaps the first essential is that parents shall 'become as little children' themselves." There is no end to what a parent can do for a child if he or she will understand him, *as a child,* but this understanding cannot come from mere good feeling; it must come from study and observation and untiring effort. The Children's Bureau says, "Parenthood is a profession and as such needs training, and of not one parent alone, but both. The child has a right to two parents and a right to them permanently."

Economic Causes of Parental Failure

It is probably more difficult to remedy the failures in parental service that come from economic causes than those which come from ignorance of child needs, even though we have far more supplementary aids for the former. To cure ignorance means to educate individuals, but to change unfavorable economic conditions means in

many cases sweeping social and economic readjustments. It is fairly simple, for instance, to teach an ignorant mother the first principles of child hygiene, but how can one expect that mother, if wages and income are too low, to provide the right food for her child, even though she knows what it is? It is possible to teach a man his duties to his child and the needs of his growing boy in the way of home training in morals and ethics, but how can we expect a steel-worker, for instance, who is on a twelve-hour shift, so that his home is necessarily little but a place in which to eat and sleep, to find time for providing that training, or even to know that his boy is a truant from school, has joined a tough gang and is stealing in the neighborhood? We provide temporary relief for the children in many such cases, but even so we have not touched the cause of the condition.

There are people who believe that economic conditions are the fundamental causes of child neglect and exploitation and that only through economic readjustment can we attain any real child welfare. But they seem to leave out of account the parents whose incomes are good, hours of labor short, and homes more than habitable, who still fail to minister to their children's needs. Actually, both causes of failure in parental service must be recognized and neither can be emphasized to the exclusion of the other.

In the same way, on the economic side, indeed on every side, child welfare is so obviously bound up with adult welfare that we cannot separate the two. The child is, like the rest of us, a member of society and, like the rest of us, is affected by every phase of our social organization and every change in it. Whatever makes for adult

welfare, inevitably touches adults, eventually touches children; and everything that affects the economic well-being or social efficiency of men and women affects children.

Income

The provision of food, shelter, clothing, health, recreation and education all takes money, and where the money is lacking, the child suffers. We have, actually, no general standard in America as to the amount of income necessary for decent family life. No single standard will cover our variety of localities, and as soon as one standard is fixed, it is out-dated by economic changes. But estimates have been made, and the general conclusion from them, in comparison with actual incomes, is that "there is a tremendous deficiency of the wage level as measured by rational human needs." In 1919 at the Children's Bureau Conference on Minimum Standards of Child Welfare it was stated that studies in Chicago and Cleveland showed that "it costs approximately $1,500 a year to buy the essentials for maintaining the average family of five—mother, father and three children—at what we might consider a normal standard." But when Cleveland factory managers were asked how this compared with the wages of their men, they replied that *not more than twenty-five per cent of their people earned as much as that.* Not all of their men, of course, were fathers of families. This is only one isolated instance, yet it represents a condition that we all know exists. The Children's Bureau gives the following cost budgets for families of five—father, mother, and three children under fourteen—on the basis of prices in May, 1920:

Washington, D. C.	$2,533.97
Coal Miners (Ogburn's estimate)	$2,182.51
Philadelphia, Pa.	$2,095.09
Lawrence, Mass.	$1,790.68

Prices have declined since 1920, and these budgets are on the basis of "the minimum standard consistent with the normal development of children," but they do not take into consideration the large families which are the rule among the lower income groups and, as the Children's Bureau points out, investigations have shown that the great majority of families in the United States do not have an income sufficient to maintain the standard of "health and reasonable comfort" here implied. In Washington, D. C., in 1916, 38 per cent of 2,100 families studied had incomes of less than $900, and 61 per cent less than $1,200, including the earnings of mother and children under sixteen. Yet in 1916, $1,200 was the estimated comfort budget for the "average family" in Washington. In 1917-18, of 2,084 families in New York City, 51 per cent had $900 or less a year, and 72 per cent $1,200 or less. A survey of 92 industrial cities made by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1918-19 showed that the average annual earnings of the father in white families was $1,349.15, and in colored families, $976.44.

We do not know actually what the cost is in dollars and cents of rearing a child, but here again estimates have been made. William F. Ogburn, of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, said, in 1919, at the Children's Bureau Conference mentioned above, that on the basis, *not of what the child ought to have,* but what does happen to family budgetary costs where children are born and reared, $1,325 is the amount added during sixteen years

of a child's life to what the costs of food, clothing, rent, etc., would have been if there had been no child. "But the actual cost of what the child consumes is far more. . . . Although the net increase of the budget for food and clothing is only $985, the actual cost of the child's food and clothing is $2,275. *The difference between the increase in family expenditures caused by the rearing of children and the actual cost of food, clothing and other items consumed by them indicates the extent to which the general family standard is lowered by their presence.*" And Mr. Ogburn very pertinently asks, "Does the father's wage go up when a child is born, and another, and another? No, as the family grows larger and older, the father's earnings do not increase because of this fact. What does happen?"

It takes little imagination or little observation of poor families to know what does happen. "In the case of the anthracite coal-miners whose incomes are discussed above, child labor was one thing that happened. Almost half of the children whose fathers earned less than $850 a year left school for work, while only 11 per cent of the children whose fathers earned $1,850 or more had done so." And so in infant mortality, for instance, the Children's Bureau has gathered very striking evidence of what happens when incomes are low:

In Johnstown, Pa., for all live babies born in wedlock, the infant mortality rate is 130.7. It rises to 255.7 when the father earns less than $521 a year, and falls to 84 when he earns $1,200 or more.

In Montclair, New Jersey, the rate was approximately two and one half times as high among families where the income was less than $12 a week as among families where the income was $23 a week or more.

In Manchester, New Hampshire, the infant mortality rate shows a marked and almost regular decline as the father's earnings become larger. In the group of babies where the father's earnings are less than $450 per annum the infant mortality rate is 242.9, while in the next group, where the fathers earn from $450 to $549, the rate is 173.6. The rate, however, does not fall below 100 until the father's earnings reach $1,050 or more. Babies whose fathers earn $1,250 and over per annum have a death-rate of only 58.3.

Child malnutrition also results from inadequate family income. In a study in New York City in 1917-18 of the high cost of living in relation to health it was found that in 2,084 families representing "a fairly typical cross section," meat was eliminated from the dietary in over 37 per cent of the families and reduced in 17 per cent; eggs were eliminated in almost 40 per cent of the families and in 532 families they were eliminated from the diet of children; butter was eliminated in 30 per cent and in 370 families from the food given to children; sugar was eliminated in almost 7 per cent and omitted from the children's food in 71 families; and milk was eliminated from the children's dietary in 296 families and considerably reduced in 71. In Baltimore in 1918, 66 per cent of the children seven years of age and younger in families visited were receiving no fresh milk; in Washington 45 per cent of the children seven years of age and younger were receiving no fresh milk; and in New Orleans 70 per cent of the children eight years old or younger were receiving no fresh milk.

By way of remedy we have devised many forms of poor relief, private and public, poor funds, mothers' pensions and children's scholarships, as well as free health clinics, child welfare centers, and other supplementary

aids, but none of these does more than scratch the surface. The weakness in mothers' pensions, for instance, lies in the fact that they are frequently given only to widowed or deserted mothers and that usually the amount granted is insufficient for a child's real needs. The whole question of income and standard of living has been put very forcibly before us in our post-war wage adjustments, in the steel, coal and railroad strikes, and we cannot afford to forget in all our discussions of it this vital connection between very low wages and the welfare of American children. If we are to face the question squarely, we must know just where we are, and there are at least two things to be remembered in attaining that knowledge:

1. That since every community as well as every home has a duty toward its children, every community should know and can learn by careful surveys what the actual cost of child care is within its limits.

2. That in any consideration of community service to children, the community must know and can learn what its income levels are and what the minimum level is for decent family life.

We make no claim that every family in America can have an adequate income, but we must realize more than we do the importance of income in our national life. Dean S. P. Breckinredge has said, "When once quantitative adequacy has been realized, qualitative value may receive greater attention. . . . Until quantitative adequacy has been attained, however, attention to the variety and richness of life must in considerable measure be postponed. But by so much the more is both our present and our future community life impoverished."

Wage-earning Mothers

One immediate effect of a low wage earned by the man of a family is, of course, the entrance into industry of the mother and even the children. This is an era of Women's Work, and few are the people who would have the temerity to say that no mother has a right to enter the class of wage-earners. For the mother whose income is below the subsistence level, it is not a question of rights, but of necessity, and the Children's Bureau states that poverty is usually the cause of the mother's going to work. What, again, happens to the children? In a study of Wage-earning Mothers in Chicago in 1918-20, the Children's Bureau concludes that the children suffer in a number of ways. There were 2,066 children under fourteen in the 843 families studied, and while many of them were put in day nurseries while their mothers were at work, and some were under the care of relatives, neighbors, landladies or lodgers, of the 1,328 children not in day nurseries, 365 were left without any provision for their care outside of school. As to their food, in 47 families the children had lunch at school; in 40 the mother prepared the lunch before leaving home and the children either ate it cold or warmed it up themselves; in 19 families the children got their own lunch; in 18 they bought their lunch themselves in stores or restaurants; and in the rest of the families they had their lunch with relatives or neighbors or even in their mothers' working places. The school attendance of these children compared unfavorably with that of other children in the same neighborhood, and over one third of them were below the standard grade for their ages. "In less tangi-

ble, but possibly more important ways the children suffered from the fact that their mothers were under the strain of a double job. . . . Numerous instances of overfatigue and ill health of the mother were reported," with consequent loss to the children. It was found in somewhat over half the families that "the inevitable disadvantages attendant upon the mother's employment away from home were not compensated for by an 'adequate' family income or sanitary material surroundings." Every endeavor must be made either to keep the mother in the home or, if her absence is necessary, to provide special care for her children.

Given a wage commensurate with higher standards of living, there still remains the problem of a child in a home. Both are personal, not impersonal. The state exercises a guardianship over its children and its homes. But it is a mass guardianship. The larger personal responsibility is with the individual home, the individual parent and on the individual child.

To be well born is the first essential. No state Burbank can grow roses on tomato plants. No state law providing pure milk can obligate a home to use pure milk or to care for it. The state may enact a law limiting the height of buildings to provide light and air, but it cannot make parents open the windows of the child's bedroom. The state may pass minimum wage laws and its people may still spend unwisely and ignorantly. The state may provide schools for five hours a day for 160 days a year of the child's time, but it cannot control directly that larger education which comes out of the remaining nineteen hours a day of the remaining 205 days.

A school may provide lessons in hygiene, but the home

may send a child to school after a hurried breakfast of a cup of coffee and a doughnut. The school may teach the child to read, and the home may have no book on its center table. The school may give instruction in citizenship, and the community, through its negligence of all that is good in citizenship, may destroy the school instruction. A school may give manual training for ninety minutes a week, and the home may offer nothing in the way of useful labor. A school may teach a girl to cook, and the mother may not wish to bother with "dabbling around the kitchen stove."

A home after all is in a larger home—the community itself. The latter is an expression of the combined action of individual homes. It is here that we find community health, community work, community music, art and recreation. The school will do its part. The home through the parent has much greater responsibility. But the community itself must provide examples of better and finer living if the individual home is to find its inspiration and the individual child its expression.

What the Home Should Provide

The family home is responsible, as we have seen, for the child's whole well-being and everything that pertains to it. Some things, such as food, shelter, comfort and care, the normal home provides without any outside aid; in other things, such as health, recreation, education, and religious and moral training, the home looks to other specialized institutions for help, but is nevertheless responsible. For the first group of child needs, food, shelter, comfort and care, the chief necessities are a real knowledge of child needs based on study and thought,

and sufficient income to provide them. For the second group, fullest knowledge of the possibilities of outside social agencies and coöperation with them are necessary, but especially the home must have, again, knowledge of the child's special needs and a deep sense of parental responsibility. All these various rights and needs of childhood will be discussed in detail in later chapters, but there are certain aspects of the home's special relation to them that must be studied here.

Health

The first duty of every parent is to *know* his child's physical equipment. From the very start every child must be weighed and measured regularly to be sure that he grows normally, and to be sure of this, the child's individual growth must be tested on the scale of normal weights and measures such as are provided by the U. S. Children's Bureau, by community children's clinics or in any standard book, such as Dr. Holt's, on child care. But, more than this, every child should have thorough periodic physical examinations, either privately or in a clinic or school, for the detection and cure of every remediable physical defect. The day of near-sighted children who struggle along without glasses and deaf children who are receiving no special care should be over, but there are still many parents who assume too easily that their child is "well and happy" and so fail to cure, when they may be cured, many physical ills.

Recreation

Joseph Lee says, "Play for grown people is recreation, —the renewal of life. For children it is growth, the

gaining of life. The problem of children's play therefore is the problem of whether they shall grow up at all, and full opportunity for children's play is the first thing democracy will provide when it shall have truly been established." Too many people still confuse play with idleness, but nothing could be further from the truth. Play, for a child, is growth and learning and expansion; it is as natural as eating and, in its way, as necessary. But, by the same token, it must be regulated, just as diet is regulated, to suit the child's age and development and to help him along the way. On the other hand, it must not be too much regulated, lest the spontaneous charm of it disappear. Happy play is a delicate and wonderful thing and it must be handled delicately. It is worth all the study and care a parent can give it, and there is plenty of material for that study. There are more and more books on play year by year. Indeed, it would be illuminating to many an "intelligent" parent to step into a good library and learn from the titles alone how high a place psychologists and medical men and social workers accord to that simple term "play."

But, presupposing a knowledge of play and its relation to a child's growth, the things the home must provide, put in the simplest way, are:

First, a place both indoors and out to play; the right things to play with; and somebody to play with. For while play is in the beginning largely an individualistic affair, it is a sad child who must play alone, and even the smallest baby needs someone, preferably his mother, to be, as Joseph Lee puts it, "at once instigator, audience, playmate, playground and apparatus."

Second, and especially as the child grows older, knowl-

edge of the outside sources of recreation in the community, knowledge of whom the child plays with, where and under whose supervision. Especially must all parents look into the resources of their communities in the way of playgrounds, children's libraries, decent motion picture theatres and even dance-halls, if they want their children to be safeguarded and given every chance for growth.

Education—Books

We are apt nowadays to overstress the educative value of books, forgetting, in our eagerness to "train" children, the play value of books and that, as Annie Carroll Moore says in her delightful *Roads to Childhood,* which every parent would do well to read, "dreams, fancies, humor, are the heritage of childhood and are at the foundation of what is beautiful and poetical in literature, art and human experience." Miss Moore describes the attitude of a mother who came to a book caravan to find an "authentic" book on animal life for her nine-year-old son, but was not interested enough to go into the caravan and look for it. The child went and brought out the *Burgess Bird Book* which the mother promptly rejected as not "authentic." But the attractiveness and interest of the book to the child did not appear pertinent questions to her, and yet it is only through interest that children learn.

Children need books; they enlarge their world, open their minds and give them new and happy thoughts. But we cannot be didactic about children's reading. The only rules we can lay down are to begin early enough and, as Miss Moore says in the book quoted above,

"Never feel afraid to recommend the best of any kind and leave literature free to make its own appeal. *It goes without saying that you must have first-hand knowledge of the books you recommend and a growing understanding of child nature outside of books.*"

Beginning early enough means at the very start. The baby who is fortunate enough to have nursery rhymes, old songs and hymns sung or recited to him from the beginning, and fairy tales and Bible stories told to him as soon as he is ready to listen—and that is earlier than many parents suppose—has a background that nothing can shake. "The baby whose mother has not charmed him in the cradle with rhyme and verse has no enchanting dreams; he is not gay, and he will never be a great musician."

Almost all children crave books, and if they do not find them at home, will go wherever they can find them. And if they do not find the right kind of books, they will read the wrong kind. Fortunately there are public libraries and school libraries to help them find the right kind. But there is no substitute for the joy that it gives a child to have his own favorite books about him in his home, to live with them, and to share them with his friends and with his parents.

The mutual enjoyment of good books, of songs and stories, "reading aloud" and "looking at pictures" form a bond of sympathy between parent and child that cannot be lost. Roosevelt, in his unusually happy relations with his children, used to take time to read to them for about three quarters of an hour every evening and he said, "This reading to them in the evening gives me a chance to see them that I would not otherwise have, although

sometimes it is rather hard to get the time." And if other fathers in America so devotedly "took the time," there would be fewer book-starved children and incidentally a much higher public taste in literature, for the parent as well as the child is apt to learn things when they read together.

Every now and then criticism is raised of the public taste, as, for instance, the recent proposals of public censorship. But early habits of good reading are the best guarantee of good taste in later life, and guidance in childhood reading is the best censorship in the world of adult reading—and writing.

There need be no fear of creating a bookish child. As G. Stanley Hall points out, the normal child will never be bookish. Books are merely a part of the many happy things in his environment that he enjoys and if the other things are there, too, he will not exclude them. He may have a period of preferring books to anything else, but he will soon pass out of that, if other interesting things are around him, and it is all a part of the testing and trying that makes the child's development.

The National Education Association and the American Library Association have published a list of books, "a twenty-five foot library" for a country school, that might equally well be the basis for a home library for parents who want their children to have books but are not sure of the best.[1]

But before all and with all the other books, there must be in the child's library—the Bible. I have read in the Koran, and there Christians are frequently referred to as the "People of the Book." It is a discerning char-

[1] See Reading List, page 238.

acterization, for it is in the Book that our constitutions have their roots—in its Pentateuch, its Proverbs, its Psalms, its Parables, its Commandments, its Lord's Prayer, its Beatitudes. But if we are to continue to be the "People of the Book," if it is to remain our great devotional epic, we must make it a part of our daily reading beginning with childhood. There is no other book that we could not do without. This is the Book with which alone we can do.

Six Princeton professors gave, not long ago, a list of ten books that they would take with them if obliged to spend the rest of their lives on a desert island. All put Shakespeare on their lists, but two omitted the Bible. It is inconceivable that any man of our civilization would venture away from it without the Bible. I do not know (as even Huxley has intimated) by the study of what other book our children are (as he put it) to be so much humanized or made to see the relationship of this life to the two elements or the duty of life to life while here on this earth. I do not understand how one can know the full beauty and strength and richness of English speech or have highest mastery of its use who has not an intimate acquaintance with its phrase, its imagery, its poetry. I do not know how one is to keep one's faith in the "irresistible downfall of moral evil" or in the persistence of infinite good who does not have constant refreshment from this living fountain.

When Stanley was writing of his journeys in Africa where he had only the Bible and newspapers, (wrappings for his provisions), he said, "As seen in my loneliness, there was this difference between the Bible and newspapers: the one reminded me that apart from God my

life was but a bubble of air, and it made me remember my Creator, whereas, the newspapers fostered worldliness." There is need of both.

Professor William Lyon Phelps of Yale University in the introduction to his admirable book on *Human Nature in the Bible,* recently published, says:

"Everyone who has a thorough knowledge of the Bible may truly be called educated; and no other learning or culture, no matter how extensive or elegant, can, among Europeans and Americans, form a proper substitute. Western civilization is founded upon the Bible; our ideas, our wisdom, our philosophy, our literature, our art, our ideals, come more from the Bible than from all other books put together. It is a revelation of divinity and of humanity; it contains the loftiest religious aspiration along with a candid representation of all that is earthly, sensual and devilish. I thoroughly believe in a university education for both men and women; but I believe a knowledge of the Bible without a college course is more valuable than a college course without the Bible. For in the Bible we have profound thought beautifully expressed; we have the nature of boys and girls, of men and women, more accurately charted than in the works of any modern novelist or playwright. You can learn more about human nature by reading the Bible than by living in New York."

It has seemed to me that the daily reading of the Bible, with its incidents remote from our daily life, helps, as nothing else, to lift our thought into a consciousness of the long past which in turn enriches our present as we turn to our tasks in it. It is a ladder such as is visioned by the poet O'Shaughnessy for John the Baptist:

He thought there should have been
A golden ladder set for him each day to climb
Athwart some opening in the skies
And see His face where shadow fills all time.

Religious Training

But above all other factors in the failure of the home to provide a wholesome atmosphere and satisfactory environment for the complete unfolding of the life of the child is the inadequacy of religious training which the average child receives in the family. "If you would point to the weakest spot in the Protestant Church," says Dr. Walter S. Athearn, "you would put your finger on the army of 27,000,000 children and youth in our own land who are growing up in spiritual illiteracy, and 16,000,000 other American Protestant children whose religious instruction is limited to a brief half hour once a week, often sandwiched in between a delayed preaching service and an American Sunday dinner. Let it be burned into the minds of the leaders of the Church that a Church which cannot save its own children can never save the world."

The Church begins its task of saving the rising generation by laying upon the hearts of Christian parents their responsibility for the training of their young children. It supplements this training as best it may by means of the Sunday school and other forms of organized religious education, but the real foundations of moral and religious training are laid long before the child reaches the age where school life of any kind is possible or when any form of organization aside from the family can bring any influence to bear. The ideals of life which

characterize all subsequent relationships are governed by the ideals that pervade the home and which the child unconsciously absorbs even through its mother's milk. Among the things which are definitely taught in the very early years of life are the conceptions of right and wrong, reverence and respect for authority, recognition of the rights of others and the beginning of such concepts as God, heaven, rewards and punishments for moral conduct. If the child learns anything of the nature of truth, he learns it in the home. It is there that he is taught to respect the property of others and the wrong that is involved in theft. The State tries to achieve by its judicial system the inculcation of these ideals in those who have never received them in the early years of life, but with what doubtful results and in the face of what an overwhelming handicap, every superintendent of prisons or correctional or probational officer will testify.

The ideals and concepts referred to above are absolutely fundamental in the life of every individual, not only to his subsequent religious development, but to his moral and ethical development as well, and ultimately to the general welfare of society. It has been well said, "Spiritual illiteracy is the forerunner of moral bankruptcy and moral decay." A committee of the Federal Council of Churches, after studying reports from hundreds of chaplains, Y. M. C. A. secretaries and other religious leaders who worked among soldiers during the war, reports a general agreement upon the number of essential lessons to be learned among which is the following significant statement:

"The religious instruction and training given in the home outlives all other religious education. In directing

and controlling that influence lies our greatest opportunity. One leader expressed the consensus of opinion in this way, 'The faith they have came from the home for the most part, and generally from a good mother who taught them.' "

Too much emphasis cannot be laid upon this kind of testimony. There is no time for deep impression like the plastic years of youth, and the home presents the golden opportunity of molding life and shaping character.

Conditions have changed radically during the life of the past generation. Most people of middle age and more remember the environment in which they grew up. There was a big house and a big family and, compared to modern conditions, there was ample leisure. The family altar was one of the established institutions of the home. At least once a day the father who was, not only the head of his house, but the priest of his family, got the family Bible and, after reading a passage from it, lead the household in prayer. The life of many a man and woman, now harassed with business anxieties and burdened with ceaseless care, has been made steady and serene by the legacy of this gracious influence and out of it has come the courage to carry on in the face of difficulties and discouragements.

The conditions of life under which we live today are very different from those pictured above. The big house has shrunk to an apartment of a few rooms. There are fewer olive plants around the table and there is no leisure whatsoever. Most significant of all is the fact that there is no family altar. Father and mother are able to maintain their moral poise and to front the storms of life buttressed by the faith that was instilled

in childhood in the atmosphere of a Christian family. But what will the children of today do when they face the storms of tomorrow without this moral impress of the early and formative years of life. It is not too late to modify the conditions in which the modern American family is living in their spiritual if not in their material aspects. If there are fewer children, they must be of finer quality with deeper and more consecrated personality and so capable of exerting a larger influence upon the world into the maelstrom of which they are presently to be projected. The family altar can be set up even within the four walls of a city flat. Time can be found for spiritual exercises and for family devotion, if not in the morning, then at night. There are twenty-four hours in the day just as there were a generation or two ago. They are more crowded, to be sure, and more things are competing with the spiritual influences for the possession of the precious moments, but after all it is a question of how we will use our time and back of that the more fundamental question as to what we deem most worth while. Out of the crowded and busy life—one of the busiest the world has ever seen—the Master said centuries ago, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."

III

Child Health

Present Health Conditions

Since the War there has been a tremendous increase in the efficiency and extent of health work in this country, due chiefly to our sudden awakening to real health conditions in the nation. When the physical examinations under our army draft law showed that approximately one third of all our men between eighteen and thirty-one years of age were unfit for military service and that only 53 per cent met fully the military standard of physical fitness, it was a shock to many people who like to believe that we are a healthy nation. But every estimate of physical fitness that we have and all our mortality statistics come to the same conclusion: as a nation we have not taken care of our health. It is estimated, on the basis of local studies, that every day 3,000,000 people are sick in the United States, that for every person in the United States there is an average annual loss of 13 days because of illness, and that 600,000 persons a year die prematurely of preventable disease. The National Tuberculosis Association reports that our annual death-rate from tuberculosis alone is 120,000—equal to the whole population of such cities as Des Moines, Fall River, Nashville, Youngstown or Salt Lake City. The Children's Bureau states that the maternity death-rate is higher for the United States than for any other principal country.

As to the health of an average community, the

Framingham Health Demonstration in 1918 showed that of 4,473 persons examined in a period of a few days, 3,456, or 77 per cent, were found to have physical disabilities, 2,443 of this number having only minor ills such as defective teeth, colds, enlarged tonsils or glandular affections, but 1,113, or 25 per cent, having serious ills. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company reports that of a typical group of factory workers and clerks examined 67 per cent were found to have physical disabilities. And on the basis of the Framingham and other community studies, Dr. A. C. Burnham estimates that in a community of 1,000, there are always at least 60 people in need of medical treatment. About 20 or 30 of these are too ill to work, while the rest, many of them having chronic diseases, feel the effects of illness but still work and receive treatment only periodically.

Significance of Health

But what does it mean? What does ill health or poor health mean to the community and the nation? Professor Lewis Terman in the *Hygiene of the School Child* makes a very clear statement of the *money cost of health.* "The minimum average loss to society from each postponable death has been elaborately figured at $1,700. Of the 1,500,000 deaths in the United States each year, the combined opinion of the best medical authorities regards at least 42 per cent to be postponable, or 600,000. The annual loss to the country from this cause is, therefore, $1,700 \times 600,000$ or $1,020,000,000. Nor does this complete the story of waste. For each unnecessary death there are several cases of unnecessary illness, the total cost of which, counting medical attendance and wages

lost, amounts to nearly $1,000,000,000 more." Bearing on this question of loss of wages, the Pennsylvania Health Insurance Commission estimates that in that state alone employees are losing $39,000,000 in wages annually because of illness.

But the money cost of ill health to the nation is one of the least of its social effects. Ill health and the state of poverty are so closely bound together that social workers consider ill health both a cause and a result of poverty. Dr. Devine says, in *Misery and Its Causes,* that "Ill health is perhaps the most constant attendant of poverty. It has been customary to say that 25 per cent of the distress known to charitable societies is due to sickness. An inquiry into the physical condition of the members of families that ask for aid, without taking any other complication into account, clearly indicates that whether it be the first cause, or merely a complication from the effects of other causes, physical disability is at any rate a very serious disabling condition at the time of application ot three fourths—*not one fourth*—of all the families that come under the care of the Charity Organization Society." The American Medical Association states that "as a result of an investigation covering 43 cities and over 30,000 charity cases, the United States Immigration Committee found that illness of the bread-winner or other member of the family was a factor in 38.3 per cent of the cases of those seeking aid."

Ill health and unemployment have an equally close relationship. When 2,000 unemployed men were examined in the Municipal Lodging House of New York City in the winter of 1913-14, it was found that 75 per cent of them were below normal in health, not as a

result of exposure or starvation, but of poor constitution. Commenting on this and on the known difficulties of finding work for the unemployed, Dr. Rudolph Binder says, "If the total percentage of low-vitality men among these 'out-of-workers' should be only 50 per cent—reckoning those in the municipal lodging house to have constituted the lower strata of the unemployed—it would seem rather useless to provide jobs for people who cannot hold them. Many men are unemployable not because they are unwilling to work, but simply because their vitality is too low to stand the strain of regular application to work."

And the relation between ill health—both mental and physical—and delinquency and low morals is becoming more and more clear. To quote Dr. Binder again, "The view that there is generally a close connection between poor health and low morale is becoming more permanently established on the basis of scientific investigation. A better and more intelligent pursuit of health would consequently assist in solving some of our moral problems."

Indeed, "a better and more intelligent pursuit of health" would help to solve a large number of our social problems. Good health means efficiency and vitality, a readiness to face the world, exactness and accuracy, ease and cheerfulness, constructive use of leisure for both bodily and mental strength, and, above all, the ability to fit into the scheme of things. Poor health means the opposite all along the line. It produces misfits; it causes inefficiency and unemployment; it causes poverty; it results in a lowering of mental and moral tone. As Dr. Binder sums it up, "Whatever aspect of society we may

consider, whether it be the arts of peaceful civilization, or the clashing arms of war, or the depressing problems of social inefficiency, or the future of the nation, we are always led back to health as *a fundamental factor in social progress.*"

Importance of Child Health

Almost all recent writers on health problems emphasize our lamentable ignorance of how to be healthy. We have never learned health habits. We have taken health very much for granted and consequently, having failed to conserve it, pay enormous costs, not only in money, for our folly. Doctors have been somewhat to blame for this because, being very busy with curing, they have not until recently found time or thought for educating. But now "preventive medicine" and "health habits" are words that are of growing significance to us all. Even so, as Dr. L. Emmet Holt puts it, "We have not been very intelligent with respect to our health in the past. For the most part we have been endeavoring to teach adults to reform, to change their habits of eating, drinking, bathing, sleep and exercise. Workers in the health field are beginning to appreciate the fact that the health education of children is the great opportunity of the future, as yet scarcely touched. . . . Childhood is the time before habits have been formed and prejudices established. The twig is so easily bent in the right direction."

It is, then, because we now realize that good health depends on right habits of living—not merely because a child is a future adult—that child health has come to a position of such importance in this country. It is the

logical outcome of our interest in prevention and in health education. Indeed, health education seems to most experts in the health field the really vital thing in any health program. But child health, of course, begins at home; his habits are formed at home, and he carries them through life. And so any child health campaign must also be a campaign of parental education. One of the greatest things we can do for the promotion of national health is to bring parents to a realization of the importance of health habits, of how they are formed day by day, and of the fact that health means not merely care when a child is sick, but the right food and the right clothes, fresh air, play, rest and training day after day, with no lessening of interest simply because the child is "well." And this is why all public and private health work that reaches parents—mothers' clubs, health clinics and nutrition classes—is of prime importance. This is one reason, also, why the public health nurse or visiting nurse has come to be regarded as vital to community health. Because she has access to homes, the nurse is a quick means of bringing health education to parents, and even though adults may be hard to teach, where it is clear that their children's well-being is at stake, they are usually ready to learn. Many churches have already realized this fact and have organized mothers' clubs for the training especially of young mothers in child care. But there is an enormous field for development here, and the least any church can do is to coöperate fully with every organization in its community that will bring health education into the homes of its peoples.

Health Education for Children

As to the children themselves, they must be trained in health habits not only at home but at school and wherever they gather for recreation or instruction. Many people believe that in spite of the home's undoubted influence, the school is the place to start health education, because homes are hard to reach, because while parents mean well, they are often foolish as regards their own children, because while children frequently rebel against home rules, they will accept them at school where they expect regulations and instruction, and because it is possible to appeal to their competitive spirit where they are taught in groups rather than singly. Certainly school health education is vastly important. And this does not mean simply text-book instruction in physiology and hygiene, or physical training in the gymnasium, but real instruction in applied personal hygiene, in what to eat and how to sleep and how to live.

Gradually our schools are beginning to realize this, as they take up more and more the study of their children's physical condition, and there are two national organizations which through the schools have been doing wonderful things along this line. They are the Child Health Organization of America (now incorporated with the American Child Hygiene Association in the American Child Health Association) and the "Modern Health Crusaders" of the National Tuberculosis Association. Both stress health rules, both present these rules in a way to appeal to children and both appear to be succeeding. The American Child Health Association appeals to the play instinct of childhood by calling the health habits the

"Rules of the Game." Through the use of clowns, fairies, story-books, songs, rhymes and plays, the interest of the children themselves in healthy living is gained and held. Teachers and health workers have been stimulated to develop innumerable methods for appealing to the child's imagination and for making health a vital part of the school program. The "Modern Health Crusaders" with pledges and badges, "health chores," score-cards, inter-school contests and rewards, appeal strongly to older children of the age to enjoy clubs, competitions, rites and ceremonies. Both organizations are successful because they are based on a knowledge of children's interests, and this is what all child health education, at home, at school, in a church club or elsewhere, must do—understand the child's instincts and interests and capitalize them—for health.

Health Conditions Among Children

Entirely aside from the educational view, however, child health work must be of the greatest importance in America today for the simple reason that all recent health studies of children have shown that child health is no better off in this country than adult health. Dr. Thomas Wood estimates that, on the basis of various school health surveys, there are 15,000,000 school children in the United States who have bodily defects of varying degrees of seriousness. Dr. S. Josephine Baker, giving a similar estimate, says that all these 15,000,000 children are in need of medical attention for ills that are partially or completely remediable. Dr. Arnold Gesell says that one public school pupil out of twenty-five must be regarded as exceptional—so handicapped physically or mentally as to

be incapable of receiving proper benefit from ordinary instruction. Miss Harriet Leete, of the American Child Hygiene Association, says that of 20,000,000 children in our elementary schools, 1 per cent are mentally deficient, 5 per cent have tuberculosis, past or present, 5 per cent have defective hearing, 15 per cent have defective sight, 15 to 25 per cent have diseased tonsils or adenoids, 10 to 20 per cent have deformed feet, spine or joints, 50 to 75 per cent have defective teeth and 15 to 25 per cent suffer from malnutrition. To turn to more specific figures—although all these estimates are based on definite studies—the New York State Reconstruction Commission in 1918 examined 720,176 school children and found that 77 per cent of the children in New York City, 57 per cent in other cities and villages and 63 per cent in rural districts had physical defects including defective vision, hearing, teeth or breathing, enlarged tonsils or adenoids, affections of the lungs and malnutrition.

These figures are all for school children simply because of the other children—pre-school and adolescents out of school—we know very little.[1] But in themselves they are sufficient challenge to awaken everyone interested in children to the seriousness of our child health problem.

Special Dangers of Childhood

Malnutrition—All children, according to Dr. William R. P. Emerson, may be divided into three classes—the sick, the well and the malnourished. And the malnourished, until they fall into the class of the sick, are apt to

[1] See recent study made by the New York Chapter of the American Red Cross called "Examination of Pre-school age Children." This study is issued by the Health Service of the New York County Chapter.

receive scant attention because they are usually considered well. Yet malnutrition is one of the most serious and dangerous handicaps of childhood. It retards growth both mentally and physically; it is a close attendant of tuberculosis; and in its extreme form, as war conditions in Europe have so recently shown, it causes rickets, scurvy and other serious diseases. More than that, almost one third of our school children, according to recent surveys, are in some degree malnourished. Miss Harriet Leete in the estimate quoted above says that 15 to 25 per cent of our school children are malnourished. Dr. Emerson puts the figure higher and says that 20 to 40 per cent of American children are 7 per cent underweight, a condition which indicates malnutrition. Dr. Holt believes that usually 30 per cent of our children are underweight or show defects of nutrition. Nor are these children from poor families only. In a recent study of children in three California schools 49 per cent of those children from "wealthy" American families showed malnutrition to such an extent that they would have been in American Relief food kitchens had they been living in Austria or Poland instead of California.

What causes malnutrition? Sometimes physical defects that hinder proper assimilation of food, sometimes overfatigue or lack of rest and sleep, sometimes lack of fresh air and exercise, sometimes "nervousness" and emotional disturbances, but chiefly improper diet and wrong food habits. This last means, not only too little food, but irregular meals and lack of *the kind of food needed by the child* at a given stage of growth, and is a subject which every parent and every child health agency must study.

Obviously the first step in fighting malnutrition among our children is the education of their parents in the nutritional needs of children—and incidentally, as Dr. Holt has pointed out in his invaluable book, *Food, Health and Growth,* the parents will learn from such education a good deal about their own food needs and the laws of dietetics. But immediately out of this first step will grow the thing that is the basis of every fight against physical ills—a real knowledge of the condition of the child. Weighing and measuring of children at home or in health centers during the pre-school age and at school during the later years are essential to proper nutritional care. And if a child proves by these tests to be undernourished, there must be a careful study of his whole way of life, since the cause of undernourishment may be far removed from the food he eats,—in the place he sleeps, in his work, in lack of rest, in his play, or in some remediable physical defect. For children whose malnutrition is caused by lack of food or wrong food, school lunches properly supervised will do a great deal. Also they afford an excellent means of teaching all school children food values. Fresh air classes for undernourished children also bring good results. One of the most effective methods of combating malnutrition is probably the "nutrition class" which need not necessarily be in school, but can be conducted in clubs, play centers, day nurseries, settlements, or anywhere that children gather regularly in groups. The chief advantages of nutrition classes are that the children are weighed, measured and examined at stated intervals, and given expert instruction and advice, their parents are invited to the class to learn their children's special needs, and the competitive spirit of the children

is used to interest them in their own gains, so that very quickly they are eager to eat the right things, sleep enough, get plenty of fresh air, and in general live sensibly for the mere joy of seeing their weight charts improve. Such classes should be in every school, but the school children are not the only undernourished ones, and until the younger children and the child laborers also receive adequate nutritional care, malnutrition will continue to be one of the chief dangers of childhood. The care of these out-of-school children, both young and old, is something which every community should provide at the same time that it cares for its school children.

Tuberculosis—We do not usually think of tuberculosis as a child disease, yet of the 120,000 persons who died of tuberculosis in the United States in 1921, 7,000 were children under five years of age. Children are peculiarly susceptible to tuberculosis, as they are to every infectious disease, and for them this disease is especially dangerous. Professor Terman tells us in *The Hygiene of the School Child* that "for the ages 5 to 10 tuberculosis kills about as many children as scarlet fever or diphtheria and more than three times as many as measles and whooping cough combined, while for the ages 10 to 15, tuberculosis kills nearly twice as many boys and three times as many girls as the other four diseases combined." According to our school health estimates, at least 5 per cent of our elementary school children have tuberculosis or have had it. The reasons for this are (1) that children are constantly exposed to the germs of the disease through adult ignorance of health precautions, (2) that so many of our children suffer from malnutrition which walks hand in hand with tuberculosis, and (3) that, again, neither par-

ents nor children are trained in good health habits—many of them, indeed, living where fresh air and sunlight are almost impossible—and do not know either how to prevent the disease or how to combat it at the start when it is curable. As stated above, the National Tuberculosis Association has started a tremendous health campaign in the schools through the Modern Health Crusaders with an enrollment of nearly six million boys and girls. But this does not relieve either parents or communities of their responsibilities in the matter—especially in the isolation and treatment of the tubercular patients, not only for their own benefit, but as protection to the rest of the community and especially the children. That communities are not awake to this responsibility was shown very clearly in the Framingham Health Demonstration, where it was found that while official records on January 1, 1917, showed only 27 cases of tuberculosis under observation in the city, after the survey, in November, 1918, there were 181 cases under observation and 69 suspect cases. There had been 29 deaths from tuberculosis during this period and 39 patients had moved to other towns, so that in all there were 242 positive cases where only 27 were officially recorded. Wherever a community fails to discover and care for every case of tuberculosis, it is endangering community health and particularly the health of its children.

Accidents—Accidents cause a larger proportion of deaths between the ages of five and nine years and ten and fourteen than in any other period of life. Out of every 1,000 deaths of children between five and nine, 167 are caused by accident. Between ten and fourteen, 177 deaths out of every thousand are caused by accident. Of the

3,483 deaths by accident in New York City in 1921, 1,054 were of children. In the one month of July, 1922, in New York City, 130 children lost their lives by accidents.

These figures are appalling, and yet they are very natural when we consider child nature and the inadequacy of accident prevention in the greater part of the country. Children are naturally liable to accident. They are curious and go where they ought not to go, try things they ought not to try. They normally insist on playing anywhere and everywhere; if they have no proper play space, they will play wherever they are. Even industrial accidents to minors are often caused by this play instinct, by the child laborer's playing with a machine or elevator while he is supposedly working. Moreover, children have not always good control of their bodies, and especially as adolescents they are awkward, bringing on themselves accidents that an adult might not suffer. Their judgment is undeveloped. They do not know what is safe and what is dangerous.

Consequently, very special care must be taken for their safety, and they must be taught, at home, at school and at work, sane and necessary safety rules. Often their very instincts of play and competition can be used to keep them from accidents, as in cities where they form their own safety committees, take safety pledges and turn some of their energies to the prevention of accident themselves.

Most fatal accidents to children are traffic accidents, falls, burns, drowning and poisoning. Among children under five, 40 per cent of the accidental deaths are due to burns, while traffic accidents figure most among children between five and nine. For traffic accidents, ade-

quate licensing and speed laws and enforcement are necessary, but it is also necessary to train the children to cross streets carefully, and to prevent their playing in the streets wherever possible. More playground space, better parental control, and better safety education will have more effect in reducing the number of accidents to children than all the safety devices we may invent.

It must not be thought, however, that accidents to children are purely an urban problem, connected with the dangers of city streets. Of 510 fatal accidents to children, the causes of which were tabulated, 110 were industrial, the results of child labor, and 200 took place within the child's own home. Even farm children suffer many accidents, as investigation has shown, due chiefly to the fact that they are allowed to undertake tasks beyond their strength and handle machines which they cannot control.

Dental Defects—Dr. Osler has been often quoted as saying that more physical degeneracy comes from the neglect of the teeth than from the abuse of alcohol. Certainly so much has been said recently as to the dire effects of neglected teeth that dental care has become almost a fad, with the result that the mere mention of it bores a good many intelligent people. Yet so far as children are concerned, care of the teeth is far more than a fad; it is one of the great necessities of proper child care for two reasons:

First, that dental defects have been shown to have an effect on the child's growth, mental as well as physical, besides being a cause of various ills.

Second, that the care of children's teeth is of lasting value because teeth that have been cared for during the

first twenty years of life are unlikely to give much trouble later.

And in spite of all our talk of dental care and the recent spread of dental clinics in our schools, it is still true that 50 to 75 per cent of our school children have defective teeth, and must be suffering the consequent hindrances in growth and development. At the Children's Bureau Conference on Minimum Standards of Child Welfare in 1919 it was stated that in the very best communities 60 to 75 per cent of the children had never had any dentistry done, although very nearly the same percentage of children are found to have dental defects when examined. The Red Cross examined 65,000 school children in a period of six months and found that 26,000 of them had defective teeth. At the same time 1,061 preschool children were examined and 764 of them had defective teeth. The National Child Labor Committee, in its studies of the health of working-children, examined boys and girls in continuation school in Newark, N. J., in 1921, and found that 57 per cent of the girls and 53 per cent of the boys had dental defects, in spite of the fact that such defects are supposed to be discovered in the physical examination required for securing work-papers and to be treated before the papers are granted. In this case the continuation school is doing a great deal for these working-children in the way of aids to health, not only in respect to dental treatment, but all along the line, but if this group of working-children in Newark, 362 boys and 463 girls, are in any way typical, it is easy to see that dental care in elementary schools, from which the working-children come, and education in care of the teeth have yet a long way to go. And in this connection

it must be noted that one great mistake which parents and workers with children make is in believing that first teeth do not matter much, and consequently failing to begin dental care soon enough. The whole secret of good teeth, either in manhood or as an adolescent, is to begin care and the correction of defects at the start. Defects in first teeth are just as likely to hinder mastication and lead to malnutrition as defects in permanent teeth. And neglect of first teeth may easily go so far as to produce an arched palate or other mouth and jaw malformation so that the permanent teeth necessarily are crowded and irregular when they come.[1]

Children Who Need More Care

In this discussion of special physical dangers, it has been said several times that the pre-school child and the adolescent, especially the working-child, are likely to be neglected. School health work has increased by leaps and bounds, especially since the war. And in the last decade, particularly since the Children's Bureau was founded in 1912, we have made tremendous strides in reducing infant mortality and promoting infant health. The infant mortality rate, which was 100 per thousand in 1915, was only 76 per thousand in 1921. The Sheppard-Towner bill for federal aid to the states in maternity and infant welfare work was passed last year by Congress, and everywhere there is great interest in protection and care for mothers and babies. This is exactly as it should be, and there must be no slackening

[1] See Dr. E. V. McCollum's book, *A Newer Knowledge of Nutrition*, 1922 edition, for effect of nutrition of the mother before the birth of the child and the feeding of the child after birth as affecting the teeth.

of interest. But in concentrating as we have so often on health work for infants and school children, we are in danger of forgetting the children outside of school who are in equal need of protection.

Pre-school children are neglected chiefly because their parents take it for granted that once they are safely past babyhood they are well. As Dr. A. C. Burnham says, "These children appear healthy, and parents are apt to dismiss signs of illness in the hope that 'the child will outgrow it.'" Yet it is in this period that lasting health habits may be formed at home. Malnutrition is apt to begin at this age when the child stops regular baby-feedings and becomes more or less a partaker of what is on the family table. Pre-school children are especially liable to accidents. Deaths from infectious diseases are very numerous at this age. Tuberculosis, for instance, is peculiarly fatal for the child under five and, where it is not fatal, is a cause of many other ailments of later childhood. Indeed the pre-school child presents a great opportunity for clubs, settlements and churches which are anxious to enter some effective field of child health work. A health center or agency that concentrates on cooperation with and the education of parents in the care of their younger children is of inestimable value in any community.

There is no system of periodic physical examinations of child laborers in general use in this country. Some cities have follow-up systems; in some cases there is a time-limit on the permit or a re-examination is required on change of employment; and some continuation schools manage to do health work. But for the most part, once a child steps into industry, we take his health on faith,

although the little we do know of industrial health hazards and the effects of certain kinds of employment on children indicate that our faith is misapplied. The Children's Bureau, the National Child Labor Committee and the National Child Health Council all recognize this fact and are working on the problem. The National Child Health Council, outlining necessary provisions for state protection of child health says, "As long as a child is of school age he should receive health education and supervision. Physical examinations should be given when he leaves school to go to work, at each change of occupation, and periodically while he is of school age." And "school age," though interpreted differently in our various states, is by no means the age of fourteen at which most children leave school for work. In most states a child must attend school until sixteen or eighteen, if unemployed, and certainly if these more fortunate children who do not go to work are to have the benefits of school health work until that age, it is unfair, not only to the child, but to the community, to cut the child laborer adrift from health supervision simply because, while he is still a child, our laws and present social usage allow him to become a wage-earner.

Mental Health

Although in this discussion of child health the emphasis has been on physical health, it must not be supposed that mental health is not of equal importance. The truth is that as time goes on it becomes more and more difficult to separate the two—so many apparently physical ills may have a mental source, and so many mental ills or cases of retardation may have a physical source.

It is unfortunate, however, that to most people the term "mental hygiene" still implies that there is something wrong with the mind that needs it. Most people, apparently, still believe that mental hygiene is unnecessary except for the mentally sick. Yet we are learning every day how imperative such hygiene is for the well-being of the normal individual—just as physical hygiene is imperative even for the normal—and how much can be done for the development of any individual through the right application of mental health rules.

In child training and child health work, mental hygiene has an especially important part for the simple reason that mental habits, like all other habits, are formed in childhood, and that these habits once formed may have even more far-reaching results than physical habits and seem to be much more difficult to change. Every progressive child welfare agency in the country recognizes this and makes special pleas for more knowledge of mental hygiene in our schools, in all work with children, and especially in our homes.

But more than that, mental hygiene or the knowledge of it explains to us better than anything else the reasons for many child problems. It points the way, for instance, to an understanding of the incorrigible child, the stubborn child, the "nervous" child, the dull child. And the better we understand them, of course, the better we can deal with them. A knowledge of mental hygiene, or at least *some* knowledge of it, must be part of the equipment of every efficient teacher, child welfare worker, and especially of every parent who wants to do the best for and to make the most of his or her own child.

Health Organizations and Health Work

With the increase of interest in health work in the last few years there has been a corresponding increase in the coordination and efficiency of all health activities. Health organizations have shown a tremendous desire to cooperate with each other, to prevent overlapping of effort, to concentrate on special problems and, in general, to organize the field of health work in the interests of efficiency. The National Health Council, made up of national organizations such as the American Red Cross, the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Child Labor Committee and the American Child Health Association, is an outcome of this desire. National and state and city health departments are evidencing a similar interest in cooperation with private agencies. But while this concentration of effort is necessary, it cannot be effective unless there is behind it all the interest and effort of communities and of individuals. National health can be achieved only through individual health, and no welfare work, no matter how worthy, can succeed unless it has back of it the inspiration of individuals eager for service.

And it is exactly at this point that the church, even though it take no active part in health work, can be of service in the promotion of child health and national health. It can in the first place awaken the interest of its members in health as a social virtue; it can inform them as to health conditions both in the nation and in their own communities; it can inform them as to national and community health agencies which need their support and their effort; in short, it can, if it is awake to

the social significance of health, inspire its members to individual cooperation with existing health agencies which will revivify them where they need it and will help them to greater efficiency and consequently greater achievement. That child health work, which at its best is preventive and educative health work, is the most fruitful field in any health program is generally recognized, and therefore the church that inspires its members especially in the child health field will be doing a national human service of inestimable importance.

Illustrations may be given to show what the Church is doing through its mission agencies in many backward rural communities, where often they are the only force at work for health. For instance, in the southern Appalachian Mountains, there are nurses under mission boards who go in and out of the "coves," up and down the mountains, not only relieving suffering, but teaching parents the care of their babies, bathing the little ones and preparing proper food. In Porto Rico, one mission hospital is said to be the largest single contribution from the States to the Island. In it many children suffering from malnutrition or deformity find health and whole bodies. In another Porto Rican town, illustrated lectures on hygiene and sanitation are given the parents at the community house and then a visiting nurse follows into the homes for more concrete instruction. This program of health-building transforms children who look like famine waifs in their emaciation into robust youths.

In Santo Domingo, where a splendid piece of interdenominational work is being done, one nurse devotes herself at the clinic to the feeding of babies. This is a

real aid in a land where the mothers know not how to feed or clothe their own little ones.

Again, a small mission day-school high up in the mountains of New Mexico is carrying out a practical health program. In the class-room definite instruction is given to these children of Mexican parentage regarding personal habits of hygiene, then credit is given to each pupil for the application of the lesson, so many points for cleaning teeth regularly, so many for bathing daily, so many for sleeping with window open. This last is a real test for those living in little adobe houses, poorly heated and located in this plaza nearly ten thousand feet above sea-level, where snow is on the ground from October to April at least.

In another New Mexican plaza, the babies are weighed regularly by the community mission worker and such treatment as will keep them up to the standard prescribed.

A boarding-school for Mexican girls in the States has instituted a course whereby the girls themselves have worked out a schedule of balanced meals, a study of the needed calories of food for each, a system of "watch your weight" and in all ways such a practical knowledge of dietetics that the homes which these girls may help to establish will maintain health.

So should the Church, wherever it goes, carry, not only the sign, (like the brazen serpent in the wilderness), but the means of helping to health those to whom it ministers. It was the way of Christ in all his active service. I found it difficult at first when in Palestine, as every one must, to realize that it was the land of the Christ, but these lines which tell of the healing work of

those who minister in His name reveal also the presence of His healing spirit:

I walked one night in The Shepherds' Field;
The stars in their wonted courses wheeled
And no new glory the skies revealed,—
There was no peace on earth.
But as I climbed the Bethlehem hill,
I saw one bend o'er one who was ill
And another bearing coals to fill
A neighbor's empty hearth,
—And I knew that the Christ was there.

* * * * *

Then I walked alone in Galilee
Where He fed the thousands by the sea
And taught and wrought in His ministry
Of human brotherhood.
There did a Presence my way attend,
There did I hear the voice of a Friend
Say, "Lo I am with you to the end,"
And my heart understood,
—I knew that the Christ was there.

IV

Play and Recreation

It has truthfully been said that we are in a period of renaissance so far as play is concerned. Historically, play, which as a broad term includes recreation, but is not merely recreative but creative as well, has always been an important human activity. "The Olympian games of the Greeks, the gladiatorial combats of the Romans, the folk-dances of the peasantry of Europe, the war-dances of the American Indian—these were play activities and not mere recreation as a relief from work." Play has been recognized as an activity worthy of study and encouragement and as productive of social results. Its effect on physical health and development has always been recognized. It is known to be one of the roots of artistic production. It has resulted, tangibly, not only in events that have affected human progress, but in additions to human knowledge, such as the discovery of electricity, and in inventions, such as the airplane. Yet, as human activities have grown more complex, as work has become more necessary and absorbing, and as moral problems have seemed more pressing, we have tended to give play a very minor rôle. It has been confused with idleness and discarded as waste. It has been confused with mere amusement and pleasure, and frowned upon on moral grounds.

But, for all this, people have continued to play. Sometimes they have played well and sometimes they have played badly; they have played little or much, according

to their environment and philosophy—but they have played, consciously or unconsciously. They are bound to play, because they need to. They are driven by an inner compulsion to play, sometimes even when they think they are working. For play, in the broadest sense, is not any particular activity; it is not athletics or dancing or social intercourse; it is not necessarily a physical activity. Lindeman calls it a zestful activity which promotes "not merely the prolonging of life, but the fullness of life." Dewey classifies as play, "those activities which are not consciously performed for the sake of any reward beyond themselves," that is, play is defined as "an attitude of mind," which may express itself in many ways, physical or intellectual. Play, then, is a state of mind, but it is also "one of the fundamental human desires or instincts." People play because they need to, and we have recently become increasingly aware of the need—hence the renaissance of play.

We have discovered that there are ill results when play is rejected or misused. Not only physical conditions, but spiritual and mental have driven us to this conclusion. We have learned that play is good in itself and that it has valuable by-products that may be put to social uses, that the stimulation of the play impulse is a social good. And we have felt that under the conditions of modern life, play is probably more necessary than ever. As Joseph Lee says, "Play is an antidote for modern civilization." Our present idea is that "recreation is no longer merely desirable for our pleasures, it is physiologically and psychologically necessary in order to retain normal equilibrium in the midst of the deadening monotony and exces-

sive strain of the common life of today both in the city and the country."

Work and Recreation

Fortunate are they whose lot it is, inherited or found, to get the means of livelihood by doing that which they would elect to do if there were no compulsion to do it. Happy are they who find the means of intellectual, moral and even physical development in the very tasks by which they earn that which keeps the soul and body together.

The artist, the musician, the craftsman, receives this satisfaction in his daily task. Through his work he creates—he lives. But artists and musicians who are able to live by their talents are rare, and the craftsman in America has long since been replaced by the invention of roaring machinery which can do more work more accurately and with infinitely more speed than he, requiring no real intelligence, but simply the guidance of a human hand. To watch these hands feeding metal rods into a machine, over and over again, thousands of times a day, or performing some equally monotonous operation with perfect precision and scarcely any variation, one has difficulty in believing that they are not parts of the machine itself. Does such a worker really *live* in his work? Does the ribbon-clerk, as she measures out yards and yards of ribbon, day after day, fulfill her heart's desire? Does the stoker express himself as he piles the coal, shovel after shovel, into the roaring furnaces? You ask him what he is, and he will answer what the world calls him, "a stoker"; but if you should look into his heart, find out his desires, his aspirations, the things he dreams when he

is at his best, the things he would really like to do, you might find he was a statesman, a football player, an explorer or even an artist or musician in embryo. He must work for his livelihood. He must work to earn that whereby he may enjoy his leisure. This will not change so long as the wheels of progress turn round. But with his leisure time comes his chance really to live—and in it he should have the opportunity to express these hidden talents and desires—to become occupied with things which really interest him—to find himself—for satisfaction of the soul's desires is that which really breeds happiness and contentment.

In producing "The Forest Princess" in a southern city, a dressmaker was discovered who designed most artistic and beautiful costumes for kings, queens, princesses, courtiers, fairies and witches, and her delight in the work was pathetic. All her life she had wanted an opportunity to try her hand at this kind of thing, but had never been able to do it until a recreation organization was formed in the city. She had been held to the making of mere fashionable clothes, when it was the gossamer garments of the mind's making her soul had craved to express.

Lorado Taft, the sculptor, tells of the great differences he found among the men of the A. E. F. Those who had already acquired, through education or otherwise, a taste for art, literature or different forms of sports seemed to have plenty of interests to fill their time unoccupied by military duties. They kept busy and comparatively happy. There was very little drinking and scarcely any profanity. The others, however, who had had no advantages, sat around with nothing to do,—they did not know how to spend their leisure time, they had no resources. Dr.

Johnson once said, "The reason why a man drinks is that he is not interesting enough to himself to pass his leisure time without it."

We all have or should have a triune day: a "work day" in which we do our share of the world's work, a "sleep day" in which we must physically rest, and a "leisure day," which for the average workingman is constantly increasing in length, a third day in which lies the greatest opportunity for cultivating our real selves, for approaching our "possible perfection." But in this period also lies the possibility of "breaking" ourselves. How to use leisure wisely is a problem which has steadily grown in importance during the past few years, and some of the deepest thinkers of our day count education for leisure as one of our greatest present needs.

The Play Movement

A definite play movement in the United States began about 1885 and grew rather slowly until 1906, when the Playground Association of America was founded, after which the growth was much more rapid until certain of our war experiences gave it even greater impetus. Between 1885 and 1917, there were 504 supervised playgrounds reported in cities of the United States. In 1921 playgrounds were reported in 502 cities, the total number of reported play and recreation centers being 4,584.

But the "play movement" is much more than the mere provision of playgrounds. It has grown from the provision of play-places for children to interest in play and recreation in the broadest and most complete sense for all people. Pageants, festivals, community gatherings and sings, community clubs, municipal camps, attempts

to revive local folk-customs and songs,—all these are parts of the "play movement" just as much as athletic games and the building of gymnasiums, swimming-pools and city stadiums. Back of them is the knowledge that "play is not merely a leisure-time activity; it is not merely an excrescence of modern civilization," that "recreation has physical, mental, social, ethical and spiritual implications," and "we must become conscious of the full implications of play, and we must make this consciousness general," for "play is a phase of life coordinate with work." So we have a play literature, a play psychology and play specialists. We take play seriously, not only as a means to certain special social results, but "as a phase of life to be served," believing that "life will not be so full and happy as it should be unless that phase of it is rightly served."

Play for the Child

To the child play is not recreational as it is to the adult. The adult reviews—re-creates—something. It may be a mind burdened, a body tired or listless that is created anew. But to the child play is growth—the gaining of life. Without it he cannot fully develop. He has the instinct—God-given—but unless it is guided, there is serious doubt as to whether it will turn itself to good. Idleness breeds mischief, but the child is seldom idle. Left to himself, he is up to all kinds of tricks which pass for play. Burying cats in flour barrels, stealing apples off push-carts "just for the fun of being chased"—all these and many almost unbelievable things boys will do if they are not otherwise occupied. It is not that they are innately bad—they have unbounded energy and for

it they must have an outlet. They take the first opportunity which presents itself. They may express their throwing instinct, for instance, by pelting green apples at passers-by, throwing stones at schoolhouse windows, or by playing ball.

Yet the adult knows that in the child's play is development. As Waddle says, "The child must play, or he cannot become a man." Raymond G. Fuller, amplifying this view, says, "The man who has never played is non-existent. He could never have grown up at all if he had not played. He could not have learned to know his feet from his hands, or learned to walk. For play begins with progressive triumph in the use of physical powers—powers of manipulation, of movement and coordination. . . . Essentially play is self-discovery and the trying out of new powers, the joyous doing of what one is able to do, the exercise of ripening capacities, an exploration in the realms of muscle and mind. . . . The motions and motives, the acts and thoughts of play, are the products as well as the causes of growth. The individual in ceasing to grow, ceases to play, and he who ceases to play, ceases to grow. The compulsions of play are the compulsions of growth, both physical and mental; inner compulsions, not external, and therefore allied to spontaneity and freedom."

Play and Work

And it is just at this point that play is clearly of greater developmental value to the child than work, for play being spontaneous, free and natural, follows and produces natural development; while work, imposed from without, because of the child's nature (Patrick goes so far as to

say that children by nature literally *cannot work*) may not, unless carefully supervised, actually follow natural and full development. It is true that children appear to have work impulses. But if we analyze them, we find that when children attack work spontaneously, they do it in the play spirit, and as soon as their inner need is satisfied, they drop it, unless they are held to it by an outer influence. Of course, in so attacking work, the child is seeking self-expression just as he is in play.

"There are several definite instinctive tendencies that are clearly common to the motivations of both work and play," says Fuller, "that of giving work some of its play interest and of giving play some of its virtue as preparation for work. Conspicuous among these is the instinct of contrivance or constructiveness. But constructiveness means more than manual activity, more than making or doing things with the hands. It has reference to accomplishment and the joy of accomplishment. When Veblen says that 'man has a taste for effective work and a distaste for futile effort,' he is referring to the constructive instinct or what he called the instinct of workmanship. The sense of efficiency and effectiveness gives work something of a play interest and satisfaction; that is, an attitude toward work that compensates for its menial and grinding features."

It is right that children should develop this. In fact, one of the best features of children's work, as distinguished from child labor, is that they do attack it in the spirit of play, find in it self-expression, and develop through it the real spirit of play which will serve them well later. As Curtis says, "most of the work of the world might as well be play as work—it depends

entirely on the spirit in which it is done. . . . Perhaps the greatest service that play has to render life is to give it the play spirit in which to do its work. The tragedy of child labor is that too often it kills the spirit of play itself."

Work in itself is not dangerous for children. The danger is that it will be carried beyond the point where it is developmental. Play never is. "Play follows the genetics of physical and psychic development," Fuller writes, "and work does not, unless carefully chosen and supervised, and even then there is danger of mistake. Play causes no overspecialization in the use of any muscle or group of muscles; work often does. In play, the fundamental muscles and coordinations get their due proportion of use; in work, the finer accessory muscles are frequently overemphasized at the expense of the fundamental and for too long a time. . . . No activity in play is performed with defective psychic motivation, since it always accords with possessed powers of coordination and effort and with the existing stock of instinctive and acquired impulses and desires. With play the child is *en rapport*."

Play is Life

The fear that so many seem to have that a child will play too much and will never learn to work comes from a misconception of play. "The child who plays much and well will be able to work much and well," says Fuller, who has given special attention to the relations among play and work and child labor. "It is sometimes believed that play unfits for work because it is taken to mean idleness or mere diversion. This view springs from the anthropomorphic conception of childhood, according

to which the child's mind is the adult's mind in miniature. It is thought that the child should be able to see the difference between work and play which the conditions of adult life suggest—work is real, play is not real; work is serious, play is not serious; work is business, play is pleasure. Play is pleasurable to children, but not pleasure as such; it is the most serious business of life; it is tremendously real. Idleness in the case of children is the exact antithesis of play. It does not develop habits of idleness—habits of idleness are encouraged by its absence. It does not develop love of ease—it often involves and welcomes hardship. Play gives the pleasure of doing the unpleasant, the moral training of overcoming difficulties. It makes the most exacting demands upon patience, perseverance, concentration and skill. It develops, not the qualities of the loafer, the shirker or the quitter, but the qualities needed by the efficient, effective, successful worker."

Work is good for children; we know it, and in this hard-working world we are not likely to forget it. What we are likely to do, and have too often done, is to be so impressed by the tangible results of work as to forget that play too has results, though not so tangible, and that, so far as the child is concerned, our interest, in either work or play, must be not in what he *produces,* but in what his activity gives him in the way of growth and development and life. "In considering the work needs of children, we consider the child, not industry. . . . Growth . . . is the really important consideration." And in considering the play needs of children, we consider the child, again, and his growth—nothing else. But to do this, and to give the child the play he needs, we must

have a far better understanding of what play gives the child than we usually have had.

There is, of course, a danger in taking a utilitarian view of play. Play is above being a mere instrument or means, and as a phase of life it is its own justification. To the child, play is no instrument, but an expression of life, and as Rousseau said, "Nature would have children be children before they are men and women." It should be enough to foster children's play on the ground that it is a part of childhood and that it helps children to live and live well *as children*. Yet there is a type of mind that cannot be satisfied with anything unless it has a use, and for that mind, the uses of play must be made clear.

Results of Play

Physical and Mental Health—For children play is a part of physical development. Gulick holds that no scheme of physical training can have the same developmental effect on a child as *natural play,* because play "is the result of selection working through unfathomable ages of evolution." It guarantees the exercise of the muscles and powers the child needs to exercise.

Work, as we have seen, does not. Hard work overemphasizes the development of some muscles at the expense of others; the mere repetition of a process in work, after the interest has left it, will produce mental dullness, which play never does. But play, as E. C. Lindeman has pointed out in connection with farmwork, may be not only recreation, but actually corrective of the conditions that work creates in exercising muscles and powers that work fails to exercise.

Play also acts as a catharsis; it gives a natural outlet

for certain instincts—the instinct of pugnacity, for instance—which, if repressed, may find anti-social outlets or cause neuroses. Terman says, "The puritanical suppression of the play instinct and of the spirit of adventure in the young may rid us of certain troublesome pranks and inconveniences, but we are coming to believe that it creates a harvest of vice, crime and neuroses. Whatever else play may mean, Aristotle's conception of it as a catharsis is essentially correct. The child whose conduct is molded too closely by adult moral standards, whose devilish spirit of adventure is denied all customary outlets, is likely some day to overflow with the accumulated 'cussedness' of years. Mental hygiene demands that the larks and pranks of boyhood be not too severely frowned upon."

Dr. Pearce Bailey, in discussing the prevention of functional nervous disorders, said, "Non-medical agencies, such as boys' clubs, boy and girl scouts, settlement agencies, and playgrounds, promise most in the line of prevention." Modern social work recognized this in prescribing play as a preventive and cure for both juvenile delinquency and nervous or mental disorders.

In city or country, play in abundance and variety is the best known preventive of evil thoughts and improper behavior—not only because of the moral training it affords, but because of the harmless expression it gives to instincts and tendencies in need of socialization and sublimation. From this standpoint play is of notable service in relation to the psycho-sexual life and the impulses and interests arising therefrom. This problem of sex runs through the whole of childhood and youth. Physiologically, play conduces to sex normality, and socially is potent in rationalizing the attitude of the sexes toward each other. . . . A playless community is a dangerous community in which to bring up children.—*Fuller.*

Education—In the *Psychology of Childhood,* Norsworthy and Whitley say: "In their play children learn to observe quickly, to judge, to weigh values, to pick out essentials, to give close attention; they learn the value of cooperation, to recognize the rights of others as well as to insist on their own being recognized; they learn the meaning of freedom through law; they learn the value and function of work and they learn too the joy of accomplishment."

The truth is that not only is play education, in the broadest sense, but many recreational activities frankly combine education with play. The Boy Scouts and the Camp Fire Girls, for instance, unite the two. Most children's clubs in churches and settlements do so. And so do the agricultural and domestic science clubs in the country. Play has long been used as a means of securing interest for education. But even so we are apt to forget the real educational values in play itself, and we are only just beginning to realize that there is room for education in playing itself, that the child who has learned how to play best has at the same time learned a great deal about how to live best. Play may be used as a means, although if its object is too obvious, it loses some of its best value—the joy of playing for its own sake. But there is so much value inherent in play that even from the educational point of view, it is worth stimulating for itself alone.

Moral Training—G. Stanley Hall holds that "play at its best is only a school of ethics. It gives not only strength, but courage and confidence, tends to simplify life and its habits, gives energy, decision, and promptness to the will, brings consolation and peace of mind in evil

days, is a resource in trouble and brings out individuality."

The beauty of play lies in the fact that it does not simply tell children they should possess these virtues, but actually produces them—in action; it makes them necessary and desirable; it makes them so normal that the child assumes them, after a time, without thinking. A pamphlet of the U. S. Bureau of Education says, "The nervous system has developed many centers of reflex action; without thinking, we respond to certain stimuli or assume a defensive attitude toward threatening danger. Boys and girls, in playing competitive games, are continually called upon to render decisions involving honesty, fairness, cooperation and will power. These decisions must be rendered quickly and accurately. Character reflex actions are developed through the instinctive desire to play."

Prevention of Delinquency—Play is a recognized preventive of juvenile delinquency because of this moral training which it gives and because of its value as an outlet for natural instincts in a wholesome way. "Mischief," according to the modern social worker, "is the play impulse gone wrong." That is, lack of opportunity for good and healthy play is considered a more real cause of juvenile "crime" than the old idea of natural depravity.

A juvenile court judge has said that in actual practice he finds that "juvenile delinquency increases as the distance from a playground increases." And conversely, social workers have reported that in actual practice, the establishment of good playgrounds has reduced juvenile delinquency in various cities and neighborhoods from 30 to 80 per cent.

An excellent example of what happens when children have an outlet for their play impulses and when they do not is given in *Rural Child Welfare*. Communities in rural West Virginia are described. "In 'A' community the play spirit is strong and is shared by young and old. There is a live school with a teacher interested in the playground and in the social affairs of the community at large. During the winter preceding our visit, several pie and ice-cream sociables had been held under the auspices of the agricultural club to which all the boys and girls belong. There had been, under the same auspices, a marshmallow toast, a number of parties at the homes of club members and two public entertainments. This does not exhaust the list of club affairs, to which must be added other parties in the community, a few dances, and in the spring and summer several baseball games. 'B' community has about the same population of children and young people, but no agricultural club, no public recreational gatherings of any kind, not a single party, or sociable, or picnic from one year's end to the other. The boys and girls as they grow up are leaving the community as fast as they can, but there are some left. The boys belong to a gang which finds its chief fun and function in going over to 'A' community, when a spelling bee or dance is in progress, and in firing off pistols . . . making all the disturbance possible, and sometimes resorting to even wilder methods of spoiling or breaking up the occasion. In another community the gang of boys finds nothing more delightful to do than to get crazy on 'old hen,' raid orchards, steal chickens, and break the schoolhouse windows. There is still another playless community where hoodlumism prevails

among the older boys and even girls, and where the smaller children are rapidly learning their ways. . . . One of the chief amusements of the young folks—from thirteen to fourteen years old—is beauing around the dark streets in the evening, and another is that of the boys who follow the sweethearting couples and shower them with rocks. In several remote and playless communities we learned of a startling number of illegitimate births to girls of fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen years and older, and on inquiry into the individual histories of these girls, we found that none had had more than the most meagre experience in vigorous play and wholesome recreation."

Some parents, however, do know this particular result of play. A report on recreation in Kentucky says, "Syrian women come to the director of the Neighborhood House in Louisville and say, 'Please take my boy and make him good.' If immigrant Syrian women know so well the effect of good recreation on 'bad' boys, shall not the whole people come in due time to an appreciation adequate enough for adequate action?"

Social Efficiency—It almost goes without saying that "good players are seldom 'queer' or socially inefficient." But they become much more than that, for in playing they have learned "how to get on with people"; they have learned team-work and cooperation. Rural sociologists are saying that one reason for the farmers' inability to attack their problems cooperatively has been that in childhood they were not used to playing together—and there is much truth in it. Play develops not only team-work, but friendliness and social adaptability. But it also develops individuality and ambition. The boy who

is a successful player is apt to be a successful worker; he has the habit of doing well whatever he is interested in. Also he has learned something of sportsmanship and the give-and-take of life, which he can carry over from play activities to work. He knows that there are rules of the game to abide by, that if the rules are not fair, they must be changed, but that fairness and openness of action are necessary above all. He knows, too, the meaning of leadership and organization. But above all he has learned the "spirit of play" with which to enrich his whole life—even his work. And he has a store of possibilities for the use of his leisure time; he knows plenty of good ways of "taking his mind off his work" and counteracting the effects of a deadening job.

The Children's Bureau, in a study outline of "Play," notes especially the "permanent interests" which a child gains through play, interests which "include every field of human endeavor and achievement." For the child learns, not only physical interests in games and athletics, but intellectual ones—literary, dramatic, artistic, musical, interests in nature, in gardening, in outdoor life, even political interest through his club life and his self-government activities in playgrounds, schools and even his gang.

Play at Home

"Did it ever occur to you," asks a pamphlet on "Play" from the Morgan Park School of Duluth, "when your boy or girl romps through the rooms of your house, making no end of noise and continually getting on your nerves, or getting mixed up in some piece of mischief—about which time he may look for a spanking, that you, his parents, may be the persons to blame and not the child?

And did it ever occur to you that there is a better way of giving the child all the play he needs where he won't get into mischief, won't tear up the house, and won't get into bad habits, and that on the contrary his play activities may be used for character building just as successfully as any other form of control or training?"

Do you happen to remember O. Henry's story of "Liz"? It isn't so different from many which court records and social workers might disclose. He tells, in his inimitable style, of a man,—red-haired and unshaven,—who sat by the window one evening in an East Side tenement, smoking a pipe and reading a paper, when Liz, a timid child of twelve, came up to him and said, "Papa, won't you play a game of checkers with me if you aren't too tired?" But the father was indifferent and he thought he *was* too tired; so he told her, in spite of what her mother said, to "go out on the sidewalk and play with the other kids" if she wanted to be amused, and not to bother him. Out onto the crowded street, where "Satan sets up his recruiting office," Liz went, for, as she said, "there was nothin' doin' for her at home." At first she just sat on the doorstep and watched the lights and the people going by, but soon the gang leader came along and became infatuated with her, and by and by they were engaged, and as time went on, Liz, with the help of his knowledge, learned more and more of what the streets had to offer. And one night, the "Kid"—for so the gang leader was called—decided "to teach Liz a lesson," and instead of taking her, he took the East Side belle, Annie, to the dance which was given monthly by the gang's club. It was more than Liz could bear. She drowned some of her sorrow in the whiskey she knew

only too well how to get, and she too decided to go to the dance. But she went with a knife in her hand, and just as the "Kid" came on to the floor, she made good her boast that she'd "cut out his heart"—and then she ran for her life—out on to the rotting pier, and "the East River took her to its bosom."

And when she was brought into court on the other side, the One who judged acquitted her, for "The Guilty Party" was still on earth sitting by the window in an East Side tenement, reading the paper and letting his children play in the street.

Joseph Lee, at the Children's Bureau Conference on Minimum Standards of Child Welfare, outlined a few play needs which he said were "some of the things we shall provide when we learn to take either democracy or education seriously." They are applicable to children at play wherever they are, at home, at school, in playgrounds, camps or recreation centers, and might be called the first principles of children's play.

The first thing that a little child needs, he says, is a mother. "To him his mother is at once instigator, audience, playground and apparatus. If his own mother is dead, he must have another to take her place. There are plenty of women spiritually dying for lack of children and children spiritually dying for lack of mothers. The two must be brought together. A mother is, of course, no use to the child when he is locked up in a room and she is working in a factory. By having a mother, I mean having one who has time to play a mother's part." That is, a child needs in play not only a playmate but "someone to share with him and be interested in what he does."

The second thing he needs is a place to play, prefer-

ably at home, but a place of his own, where he can keep his own things and know them as his own. And he needs a place both indoors and out, not only suitable for play, but arranged for play. Where homes cannot furnish these places, the community or school or church can.

Thirdly, he needs "a child-community with established play traditions, games suitable to his age that are immemorial (they need not be more than three months old to possess this latter attribute), games that are taken for granted as what every fellow does and that afford a variety for different seasons and different temperaments and talents. There may be a play leader behind the group and its tradition, but the group is the living medium for the child."

"Every child should have the equivalent of a tool house, a woodshed and an attic in his life, whether provided by the home, the school or some neighborhood institution. He must, apart from any systematic teaching, have things to hammer and cut and melt and put together, to burn, color and otherwise deal with as his soul leads him. He must have all the tools, paints, materials and suggestive objects that have the power to satisfy him and to lead him on."

"Every child should go through a period of having pets—anything from white mice to horses will do."

"Every child should be encouraged to make collections of stones or bones or leaves or some such objects, and should be shielded from the kind of nature study which is to the love of beasts and flowers what the study of anatomy is to social life."

"Every child must have a garden in his home, or two months a year of country life. In fact, he ought to have

the latter anyway and will have to arrange it with his mother or his aunt or his partner to look after his home garden when he is away."

Children need outdoor play, of course, and Lee believes that for children under six there should be a sandbox in the back yard and a general playground in the block; for children six to ten, a playground properly equipped with right leadership within a quarter of a mile; and for older children up to seventeen, playgrounds with sufficient space and equipment within a radius of a half mile of home. "The playgrounds and playhouses must be made beautiful. There must be full opportunity for skating and coasting and skiing in winter, where the climate makes it possible, and for bathing and boating in the summer."

"Every child must grow up in the presence of the arts." He must know painting and music and reading intimately, by doing them himself, seeing and hearing them incidentally around him, and not merely by having them taught him, "not having them too much explained or talked about, but finding them, as a matter of course, part of his experience. . . . The idea that children should be taught to be useful must be supplemented by the idea, equally important, that they should be prepared to live." And for these purposes, Lee says, "There should be in every neighborhood, whether in the school or library or otherwise, a house of the Muses, or rather, two houses, one for music and one for the other arts. The latter should be full of books and pictures and tables and window seats to go off and read at, with perhaps a little stage. The former should also be beautiful and have pictures and a garden besides its music rooms."

All this sounds, perhaps, idealistic. How may children have all these things, even under the most ideal conditions? But how many children, when we really stop to think about it, would we condemn to having none of these things, as we so often do in our modern way of living?

School Play

"The school is the logical play-center for children. Its geographical location indicates this, and it is here that the children actually do congregate—here they are found. Moreover, the school is preeminently the children's own public institution, and should serve more of their needs than it usually does."

School play is really of three kinds, though they are often combined. First, it is recreational, for the school child needs what the younger child does not, play as relaxation and rebuilding after work. Second, it is a part of physical training and health development. And third, it is a part of education for living—not a means of securing interest in education, but education in the art and ways of play itself. Very few schools emphasize this last feature of play. It is gained only incidentally in the process of recreation and physical training. Yet, when we think of the need of more play and especially better play in modern life as a whole, we know that the more children learn of play and how to play—using the term of course in its broadest sense—the better they will be able to live.

But in most schools play is in the curriculum only as physical training. It is required by law in many states. In some states a mark in posture or in physical training is

given on the report card. The minimum time given to training or exercise outside of the regular recess periods in most states is twenty minutes a day. In Kentucky, Georgia, and New Jersey it is thirty minutes; in New York, an hour. According to the Children's Bureau standards, every child should have a minimum of thirty minutes for play and physical education during school time, besides short recesses, and, "no less than two hours of organized play for every child outside of school hours every day throughout the year."

The three requirements for a school playground are space enough (the accepted minimum is thirty square feet per child, but this does not mean that there must necessarily be space enough for all the children to play at once) and a space leveled and surfaced for playing, some equipment and leadership. Next to space for play, leadership is the most important thing, and the one least given, especially in country schools, where teachers are not often trained in organizing and directing games. Where there is no such leadership, recess time and exercise time degenerate into "scuffling" periods, time for walking around, or playing desultory games in which the younger or less active children take no part. It should be noted that in country schools especially this is partially due to the fact that the school yards are often unleveled, small and quite unsuited to any organized game, so that it takes more initiative and imagination than the child unused to play has to find a game playable there. But even where a playground is leveled and equipped, unless there is leadership, play does not become a real factor, giving the child the most benefit possible, teaching him the best games, and keeping him away from the

games and the ways of playing that may do him more harm than good.

Community or Municipal Playgrounds

Ideally the school playground should take care of all children of school age, even out of school hours, and the community playgrounds should care only for the pre-school children and children out of school. But this is seldom the case. School grounds are too often inadequate.

According to the Children's Bureau, there should be a playground within a quarter of a mile for children under six, within half a mile for children six to twelve and three-quarters of a mile for children under seventeen who cannot afford carfare, although boys will go even further to a baseball ground.

The children themselves ask for such playgrounds. In a survey of recreation in Peoria, Illinois, in 1916, questionnaires on play were answered by 1,000 school children, and there was "an almost unanimous desire for neighborhood playgrounds, especially for the development of the school yards. To the question, "Why do you want a playground?" the children answered, "Because we won't have to play in the street"; "School grounds are too far away"; "So that many children can play together"; "In order to play more often"; and so on.

This same Peoria report states that from careful observation of 33,122 children in fourteen different cities, varying from 22,000 to 500,000 in population, 45 per cent of the children were loafing outside of school hours—doing nothing, "Because there is nothing to do"; 43 per cent were in streets and alleys; only 24 per cent in pri-

vate yards; 7 per cent in vacant lots; and nearly 4 per cent in public playgrounds. But motion pictures, dance halls, pool rooms, burlesque shows and pleasure houses had an average weekly attendance exceeding the entire population. These are grimly significant facts and hold true for most cities.

There has been, of course, a tremendous growth in community and municipal playgrounds since 1916. Yet there is no doubt that there are still thousands of children, even in smaller cities, who have "no place to play but the streets," and "nothing to do." Mr. Rowland Haynes has estimated that wherever the density of population exceeds 35 or 50 to an acre, 80 per cent of the children will be playing away from home because of lack of space around their homes. And if there is no near-by play center, of course they will be in streets, alleys, vacant lots or the local commercial amusements. One estimate of what a community should provide in order really to serve its children's play needs says there should be one acre of playgrounds for little children for every 15,000 population; one acre for a neighborhood center for every 5,000 population; and one acre for special sports for every 10,000 population. "An acre for 500 children is the smallest possible space which should be provided; when the same playground must be used for little children and for older boys and girls, the space should be divided. For the most part, no attempt should be made to play games requiring a great deal of space on this general ground, but opportunity for such games should be provided in an athletic field containing about six acres and providing for baseball, football, tennis and similar activities."

Such playgrounds may be under municipal control, or

under a neighborhood association or private agency, a church, a Y. M. C. A., a club, or under a combination of associations or institutions. The main need is for control, paid leadership or at least *trained* leadership and necessary support. The Playground and Recreation Association is ready to advise and assist in organizing such playgrounds. The Harmon Foundation, 140 Nassau Street, New York, is especially organized to give communities financial aid in founding them. The Foundation, which announces a twofold purpose: (1) to bring to communities a sense of the vital necessity of setting aside for all time open play spaces, and (2) to render certain definite aid to communities realizing this need, offers to communities of not over 10,000 in population that can conduct a campaign without the services of the Foundation an outright contribution not to exceed $500, and to towns under 500, where the need is urgent, purchase of a playground site at a cost not to exceed $2000, and lease of the land for playground purposes to an association, school board or other organization for from five to ten years, with an option to buy the land at any time.

Recreation Centers

The obvious advantages of neighborhood recreation centers are that they may serve whole families, not merely the children, and act as substitutes for the commercial amusements which are often the only play resources, especially of working people. Many churches and schools are already organized as recreation centers; many more could be so organized if they realized the need. They can supply not only athletics, games and

swimming pools, but clubs, entertainments, reading rooms, day nurseries and health service.

One of the most interesting social centers in the country is the La Salle-Peru Township High School Center in Illinois, which serves three industrial communities in La Salle, Peru and Oglesby. It contains not only a recreation building, playgrounds and athletic fields and an outdoor swimming pool, but is combined with the High School so that the plant is used continuously, and the recreation staff serve also on the High School staff. Recently a Hygienic Building has been added, with a laboratory, library and expert staff, cooperative with local and state health officers, and combining the health work of the three cities. Since the center is a part of the High School, it is maintained out of the local school funds, at a cost of about $9000 a year, but the plant was the gift of one man, F. W. Mathiessen, has been added to by further contributions from him and other citizens, and pays for itself to a certain extent in rental fees for rooms and the gymnasium. Graham Taylor, writing of it in *The Survey,* calls it "a remarkable affiliation of volunteer and public institutions," and it is certainly good evidence of what may be done by cooperation in community recreation, health and educational activities.[1]

Community Music

Music is one of the recreational and cultural activities which can be fostered at small expense, but in which few communities realize the full possibilities. Community music, in the sense of community "sings" and choruses,

[1] This is the community where fifty years ago the author attended a little district school, and the Sunday-school with the class pictured in the frontispiece.

evoked much interest during the War. But as Edgar B. Gordon of the University of Wisconsin's Extension Division pointed out in 1918 in a very interesting pamphlet on Community Music and Drama, community music means more than general singing of favorite songs. "As the movement develops, it more and more definitely formulates itself into an effort to bring back among the people a wide general participation in the production of music. It stands as a protest against the professional and vocational monopoly of the art." That is, it emphasizes not merely the value of *hearing* good music, but of taking part in the production of it.

Very few communities realize their own musical resources. And very few train children either in school or out in real and general participation in music. School singing, bands, orchestras and glee clubs, of course, exist, but very often they are purely school affairs, have very little connection with the community as a whole. Yet, as Mr. Gordon says, "The natural starting point in the development of community music and drama is in the schools. . . . Where persons outside of the schools can be brought in to work in conjunction with the students, immediately there begins a desirable relationship between school and community, which when properly fostered and directed, results greatly to the advantage of all concerned."

"Make a survey of the community and enlist the aid of everyone who is able to contribute talent of any kind," the suggestion is. "Ask only for volunteer service. Offer compensation to no one—appeal rather to the altruism of the people and try to make them feel that here is offered a chance for community service. Be sure that the people

enlisted are representative of every church and social group, because the movement must be kept truly representative if it is to succeed."

Out of children's choruses, orchestras and bands, may grow community choruses, community bands, with a universal appeal and a readiness to serve any community gathering. The school is a logical beginning. But so is a social center or a church, if the school is not ready for it. Any center will do which has a strong drawing power in the community and an interest in enriching the leisure time activities of the whole community, young and old.

Libraries

The "Children's Room" of a large city library is one of the most enlivening and heartening sights in the world, for children, given books, know how to use them, and given a "story-telling hour" throng to it from all social groups. Most cities now have, if not a children's room and library service, at least special children's shelves and an interest in children's reading. Even small town libraries have this; schools have libraries; social centers have them; so do churches. But the country child is notoriously poorly supplied with reading matter. How many country boys do we know who say, "I never had anything to read but the almanac and an old history book of my brothers"? And how many rural schools have no books beyond the few necessary textbooks and some tattered "donations" from friends?

In *Rural Child Welfare,* Charles E. Gibbons in his chapter on "Rural Homes" says that in West Virginia, at least, "The striking thing in reference to reading material is that so many families do not have books, papers and

magazines. Of the owner families, one in nine has no books at all; of tenants, one in seven; and of laborers, one in five. Three fourths of all families have no daily newspapers. Owner families average a little more than one weekly—usually the county paper—and about one third of them have no such paper. Among tenants there is a little more than one county paper for every two families, and a little less than one for every two laborer families, but three fifths of the former and about three fourths of the latter have none at all. Owners and tenants each have more than one farm paper per family, while the laborers have a little more than one for every two families. Somewhat over one third of the owners, slightly more than two fifths of the tenants and three fifths of the laborers have no reading matter about farm problems. Owners average better than one current magazine to the family, but over half the families have none. Among tenants there are seven magazines for every ten families, but three fifths of them have none, and among the laborers there is about one magazine for every two families, but nearly three fourths take none." How much reading matter has the farm child in such an estimate?

The American Library Association and the National Education Association have selected and recommended a "two-foot library" of twenty-five books for one-room rural schools. (See Chapter I.) The selection attempts to be broad and to recognize the literal starvation of country children for children's books. It contains chiefly "old favorites" and can be added to indefinitely. It makes no attempt to be "educational" in the narrow sense of the word, but rather to bring to country children some of the joy of stories and verse and autobiography and his-

tory that their luckier city brothers have had. No country school ought to be without at least this beginning of a library, and no country church, bent on serving the children of its neighborhood, ought to fail to supplement the resources of the school and homes by providing, not only religious literature, but good literature of all kinds for the children.

Commercial Amusements

Of passive commercial recreation there is plenty, and much of it is good. We have, however, become a nation of bleacherites—contented to just sit and look on. Such recreation is expensive for the average working-man—it is sometimes questionable entertainment—its after-effects are often enervating—and it does not give the individual the joy of participation, the sociability and the chance to make friends which his soul craves.

Commercial amusements — dance-halls, pool-rooms, moving pictures, street carnivals, circuses, theaters, and so on—are undoubtedly the recreational problem in which the church has been and is the most deeply interested. Children, young people—all people—will patronize commercial amusements. The church dislikes the moral influence of many of them. What can the church do?

There are only two things to do; first, secure municipal or community control of the amusements, and second, provide substitutes for such amusements as are considered harmful, other play resources which will attract the people away from whatever may do harm. On this second point there are two axioms to be remembered. First, the more wholesome forms of recreation a child knows, and the more wholesome forms there are available, the

more will they be used. And second, the mere suppression of a form of amusement is no guarantee that some other harmful form will not rise to take its place, unless wholesome amusement is at hand to fill the place. That is, the whole recreational policy of the modern church is and must be constructive, not merely repressive.

Control of Amusements

The War Camp Community Service proved successfully in many localities that commercial amusements can be controlled far more than they have been. It even proved in some instances that "when managers discover that it pays to run a decent dance-hall, they prefer to do so." And there is no reason why war conditions in this regard cannot be duplicated in peace.

Control of commercial amusements means not only laws, municipal ordinances and municipal enforcement, but back of that a civic organization or committee to give the control weight and direction. Such an organization may come from a church, a woman's club, a chamber of commerce or a combination of local bodies. One report suggesting such control advocates a citizens' committee on recreation and says, "Among its functions in this regard would be investigation of conditions and study of means and methods of improving conditions. Other functions would be publicity and propaganda. It would seek to understand the problem in all its details and relations and to impart to the community a true conception. It would work for needed ordinances and administrative machinery and for the enforcement of ordinances. It would be vigilant in its watchfulness over amusement proprietors and over municipal officials. But it would

cooperate with proprietors and encourage them in their good works. It would cooperate also with municipal officials. The committee would see that commercial amusements would meet high-class competition by promoting parks, playgrounds and social centers. It would seek thus and in other ways to develop the community taste in recreation and amusement. What is meant by the term 'citizens committee on recreation' is that there ought to be in the community some civic body, some organization or sub-organization, especially concerned with the recreational problem, the commercial-amusement problem included. The name and origin of this body is not so important as its functions."

Motion Pictures

The question of motion picture censorship is embattling all sorts of people today. On the one side, against it, are not only the producers and their friends but all the exponents of the belief in "American liberty." On the other side are the people who believe that the motion picture industry is so highly organized and so firmly intrenched that nothing but vigorous censorship can stop the obviously bad effects of some of its products, especially on children. The strength of the censorship argument lies in the fact that it is a direct method of attack. Its weakness lies in the fact that it is only superficial and does not reach the roots of the problem.

In 1921 censorship bills were introduced in thirty-two state legislatures and defeated in twenty-nine. Two states, New York and Massachusetts, passed censorship laws, and Florida provided that only such pictures be shown as had passed the National Board of Review and

the New York State Commission. Several states passed laws making it a misdemeanor to exhibit films that are obscene, indecent or detrimental to the morals of the community. In four states, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Kansas, censorship was already in effect. But for the country as a whole censorship, as such, has been fairly definitely rejected, and as Dr. Charles S. Lathrop concluded in his study of the problem for the Federal Council of Churches, the general feeling is that "compulsion should be the last resort. All efforts should be positive and constructive. Emphasis should be placed on the encouragement of the good rather than the suppression of the evil."

Any real solution of the motion picture problem means intimate study of it and of the community's relation and reaction to it. Dr. Lathrop recommends a church or inter-church committee in each community for just this purpose, hoping that out of such intelligent study there will come a real solution as to social control. And he notes that nothing will be gained by any campaign *against* picture producers and exhibitors, but that much may be gained by cooperation with them, "an effort toward community betterment which takes them in." Also he says, "But all social betterment is ultimately a matter of educating the oncoming generation. . . . The public school and the religious education departments of the churches can do more to improve recreational standards than all other agencies combined. . . . The development of artistic appreciation is primarily the business of the schools. On the moral side the efforts of the schools are supplemented by the church. A wholesome attitude toward life, and a sense of proportion as to its values render uncouth-

ness disgusting, wanton violence intolerable, and lewdness and sexual promiscuity repulsive. There is no quick route to this attainment, but there is no shorter path to a higher plane of social living. The moving picture screen reflects the prevailing social ideals and its standards will be raised permanently only as there is progress in the life of the whole community."

In relation to children and the moving pictures, it has been pointed out by the National Board of Review that since the pictures are supposedly an adult recreation, it is impractical to expect their programs to be such as will appeal to a child and be of value to him. And this is one of the ideas back of the many "Special Children's Performances" which are sponsored by schools and women's clubs throughout the country. In some cases Parent-Teacher Associations arrange regular children's programs and stimulate attendance by children. They may be given in special auditoriums or in the regular motion picture houses at special hours. In many cases it is reported that "the children like their own programs so much that they prefer them to the regular performances." And there are many organizations producing pictures suitable for children, distributing them and stimulating, by publicity, attendance at the better pictures.[1]

A Community Responsibility

The latest figures received by the Playground and Recreation Association of America indicate that recreation

[1] Information and advice in securing good films may be secured from the National Committee for Better Films, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

programs are conducted in 505 cities of the United States and that over nine and a third million dollars was spent for organized recreation in 1922. However, there are still millions of men, women and children living in cities of strangers or in towns and counties where homes are isolated and where no worth-while entertainment is offered—who are inwardly hungering for the relief and benefit which proper recreation and friendship might give.

Always we hear the plea, "We can't afford it," but last year we could afford to spend 41 cents per capita for chewing gum, $4 per capita for candy, $5.10 per capita for cigarettes, and $6.20 per capita for cigars, while the per capita expenditure of only 9 cents for public recreation for the year made life infinitely more worth the living to men, women and children, in the cities and towns providing such programs.

Communities are beginning to meet their responsibility in providing play and recreation. Churches, settlements, Boy and Girl Scouts, Y. M. C. A.'s, Y. W. C. A.'s, Community Service organizations, women's clubs, Boards of Education, industries, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs and local governments are in many towns and cities working to fulfill their obligations. Playgrounds, community centers, club buildings, auditoriums, summer camps, athletic fields, swimming pools, golf courses, have been provided in a number of communities. Games, athletics, industrial and school leagues, hiking parties, winter sports, kite tournaments, water festivals, handicraft activities, story-telling, holiday celebrations, community singing, music memory contests, picture memory contests, forums, debating clubs, lectures, community orchestras, dramatics,

concerts and strangers' clubs are some of the activities which provide an outlet for the energy of youth and the weariness of the toil-worn. Home Play campaigns in which fathers and mothers are urged to play with their children—gardening campaigns, city beautiful and city clean-up weeks are becoming more and more common.

A Share for the Church

What is the Church going to do about it? The Protestant churches in the United States represent in their buildings an investment of $935,000,000. Their membership represents the best citizenship of the community. The Church and its people have the means at hand for meeting this industrial, home and community need—that of providing wholesome play for child growth and of play and amusement for adult recreation.

The "means" are not financial. They are spiritual. Under average conditions the money cost for play and recreation is a trifle. In large cities the expense is great because the provision for it has been long neglected. In homes, everywhere, there is practically no expense. The only expenditure is parental love and knowledge. In small villages the chief expenditure is that of absolute cooperation with every agency which is or which should be concerned with the play and recreational movement. In cities there is room for many individual and corporate efforts.

In cities the children have little to "play in." In towns and villages they have little to "play for." In homes they have perhaps, no one to "play with." In the city the play problem for children costs money. In the town the problem can be solved only by wide-awake citizen-

ship. In the home the problem can be met only by sympathetic, understanding parents.

It is the part of "home missions" in remote regions where the community furnishes no play activities for the children,—indeed where the parents have no conception of the function of play,—to supply such recreational opportunities through the Church. In many of the mountain plazas of New Mexico, play has been unknown until the mission day school has furnished playground equipment and taught the children its use. In a land where even the little ones have to be fairly shoved out of doors on bright days in the beginning, it makes one rejoice to see boys and girls on swing and slide developing their inborn instinct for play. Then the parents demand admission to the grounds. After school hours, men and women may be seen on the school playground finding the recreation which was denied them in their youth. New sets of muscles are put into action, new ideas instilled and a wholly new outlook on life given.

In the southern mountains, the Church community worker is leading the people into a wholesome way of living. Organized play is instituted for the children, community "sings" and athletic contests for young people, while holidays are made the occasion for the whole family's recreation. The Church must help to give leadership wherever it is needed in the development of wholesome recreational life, especially for the children, for it is their rightful heritage in an earth whose every community should be as the streets of Jerusalem, where the prophet Zachariah saw the children playing again—the happy evidence of a "restoration."

V

Child Labor

Although some people insist that there is "no longer a child labor problem in America," the Census of 1920 enumerates 1,060,858 children between ten and fifteen years of age inclusive who are gainfully employed in the United States; 378,063 of them are between ten and thirteen; and there are no figures for children under ten although we know that especially in street trades, tenement home work, agriculture and oyster and shrimp canneries many children under ten are employed. It is possible that not all, even of the child workers enumerated in the Census, are employed to their own detriment. Yet, considering what we know of educational and health conditions among the children of America, it is safe to assume that a large proportion of these million or more children may well ask if they are having what Mr. Roosevelt called the "square deal."

As to child labor in the abstract, we are practically agreed in America, in fact in almost every country in the world, that it is wrong. We have passed law after law on the subject, and we know child labor as a social ill with an amazing number of ramifications. Yet when it comes to concrete instances, we are never so sure, and the most curious phase of the situation is that so many people, with the highest humanitarian motives in the world, allow excuses for child labor, or superficial justifications of it, to hinder the search and application of remedies.

"Child labor is necessary," we say, "because of poverty. Children must work for their own and their parents' support." Or, "It is far better for children to work than to be idle. Work keeps them out of mischief." Or, "The schools teach children nothing valuable. They learn much more at work." Or, "Child labor teaches independence and success. All American 'self-made men' worked as children." Everyone who makes such a statement believes that he is speaking the truth, and in every one of these ideas there is a certain amount of truth. But it is only a half-truth, based on some fundamental misconception, and if we carried these statements to a logical conclusion, child labor would itself be an institution for the promotion of child welfare, instead of a social ill—and few of us will agree to that.

The result of this combination of confused thinking and of prejudice is our national condition as to child labor today. We use the term "child labor" loosely to describe something we believe is wrong. We are fairly well united in regarding certain forms of occupation, notably factory work, as harmful for young children, and we believe that to a certain degree we can regulate that. But on other forms of employment, especially those to which we are accustomed, we disagree, and often, even where we reach the point of a prohibitive or regulatory law, we know that the law is not enforced because local sentiment is against it. Meanwhile, the exodus of children from school in the interests of labor continues. There are more than a million children gainfully employed in this country, and we are neither very sure how much of their employment is harmful, nor how we can stop it where it is harmful.

Our chief need in attacking the child labor question is a clarification of issues: we need more knowledge and clearer thinking. Sentiment has always played a large part in child labor reforms. The picture with which we are all familiar, of a wizened little child working hour after hour before a huge machine, is infinitely pathetic. But child labor is more than a child working at a machine. Its sources in the social organization are many, its results are varied and far-reaching, and the remedies for it are necessarily bound up with many other issues. Consequently, while sentiment and emotion have their uses, they must not be allowed to obscure our thinking on any such complicated social question. Definition, facts, such as we can collect, and careful interpretation are what we need if we are to attack the problem either wisely or effectively.

What Is Child Labor?

We have a fairly clear idea of what childhood should be. It should be a period of growth and development, and its only discipline should be that which encourages and guides development, educates and builds character and strength. Certain forms of employment, therefore, which we consider a negation or perversion of development, we label "child labor" and regard as wrong. As Edward N. Clopper defines it, child labor is "the employment of a child under eighteen years of age (because childhood and growth are presumably not over before that age), with or without pay, under direction or independently of others, which deprives him of his proper measure of schooling, training, recreation and healthy development." Under such a definition, employ-

ment that might be harmful and hence classified as child labor for a boy of twelve might do no harm to a boy of sixteen or eighteen, and would therefore be not child labor for the older boy, but simply normal employment or work.

The mere fact of working, that is not the criterion; the *effect* of the work is our interest. We are all perfectly aware that work of some kinds is good and necessary for children. This is what people mean who say that "child labor is good for children because they need to work." But their mistake lies in supposing that the opposite of child labor is necessarily idleness, whereas it should be education and play and the right kind of work, and in failing to make any distinction between good and bad forms of employment. Clearly such a distinction must be made. As Raymond G. Fuller says, "No one believes in child labor. Everyone believes in children's work." To quote Dr. Clopper again, "If we think of *child work* as connoting occupations which under suitable restriction are advantageous to children, and *child labor* as connoting those which are disadvantageous, we can draw a fairly sharp line between the two. Perhaps it would be clearer if we say that child work is educative, while child labor is exploitative. By exploitative, I mean, of course, serving the interest of the employer at the expense of the child. . . . Work alone cannot adequately educate the child; neither can school. It is only through a union of their good features *in education* that the full development of the child can be assured. I emphasize the phrase *in education,* for this is the crux of the matter; the possible needs of industry have no place in the program."

Of course the issue is not so clear-cut as it sounds;

there are too many diverse elements to be considered. But the fact remains that if here, as in other child welfare problems, we go back insistently to *the needs of the child,* regarding all other issues as for the time being secondary because we pin our social faith on the right social development of our children, we shall do a great deal to clear the air, and view, only distantly perhaps, but with greater assurance, our objective of full development for American children.

Effects of Child Labor

Education—Too early employment obviously cuts off the amount of schooling a child receives. In our school-leaving statistics it has been shown that the tendency in this country is for half the children to go through the fifth grade (although in states where educational requirements for work permits are low, many leave school before that grade) and for only forty per cent to finish elementary school. The social results of such low educational standards are all too clear.

But child labor not only cuts off education too soon, it creates irregular attendance, especially in such unregulated pursuits as farmwork or wherever school attendance laws are unenforced. In a study of 174 schools in Oklahoma it was found that the number of days of absence during one year was more than one third of the total number of days of attendance, and "work" as an excuse for absence was almost equal to the sum of all other excuses put together. In Colorado the school authorities, working for better enforcement of school laws, have estimated that in the beet-growing region, 4,841 children between the ages of six and fifteen miss an average of nine

and a half weeks of school a year because of work. In the "one-crop" section of rural Tennessee, 27.7 per cent of the owner families and 66.6 per cent of the tenant families freely admitted, during an investigation, that they did not send their children to school regularly, and "work" was the excuse for absence in 61 per cent of the owner families and 70 per cent of the tenant families.

The results of non-attendance or irregular attendance are, of course, retardation, failure to complete even the elementary grades and dissatisfaction with a school where one always fails.

There are people, however, who hold that, considering the small practical value of schooling where the schools are weak, it is better for a child to go to work and "learn something worth while." The chances of his learning much of value, however, are slight in our present organization of industry and agriculture.

The untrained child-worker naturally takes an unskilled, mechanical task. He may become skilled in one process, but there is little chance of advancement; and, as he soon becomes tired of his job, he moves aimlessly from one unskilled job to another. Any number of investigations could be quoted to support these statements. In Massachusetts a Commission on Industrial Training has reported, "The fourteen-year-old child enters unskilled industries and remains there, while the sixteen-year-old child more often enters higher grade work. The desirable industries open to the boy fourteen to sixteen years old are extremely few in number; practically all employers in such industries declare they do not want the boy before he is sixteen, while the majority place the age at eighteen, and the numbers actually employed are

few." In Cincinnati, Mrs. Helen T. Woolley says, "It is a conservative statement to say that only a small proportion of these children find themselves any better fitted to earn a living at sixteen than they were when they began work at fourteen. Some of them, particularly those in the messenger service, are of less value in the industrial world as a result of the two years of work."

For the practical-minded person, results in dollars and cents may be stated. In one city, for example, it was found that workers who had left school at fourteen had earned less money in four years than an equal group of children who left school at sixteen had earned in two years. In another large city, boys who had stayed in school until they were eighteen were earning at twenty-five almost two and a half times as much as was earned at the same age by boys who had left school at fourteen.

In Massachusetts "boys who remained four years longer in school in order to take a technical course soon caught up in salary with their brothers who stopped at fourteen, and went ahead of them so fast that by the time they were twenty-two years old, the sum of the four years' salary of the better educated boy was equal to that of the eight years' salary of those who had quit school at fourteen."

The Massachusetts Child Labor Committee, in a pamphlet addressed to boys and girls going to work, says, "Every day that boys and girls stay in school adds nine dollars to the total amount of wages they can earn when they grow up. . . . The boy or girl who stays out of school to earn less than nine dollars a day is losing money, not making it." These statements are based on figures of the U.S. Bureau of Education.

It may be argued that the child laborer's known practice of moving from job to job actually does give him new and valuable experience. But a child of fourteen or fifteen or less can scarcely be expected to use much judgment in the choice of jobs. Professor Paul Douglas says on this point: "A change of jobs is rarely a change upward, merely a change to another unskilled and routine task. . . . These changes, moreover, breed irresponsibility in the child himself. His thought is, 'If I don't like it, I'll get another job.' This prevents him from looking into the prospects of a position before he takes it, since he feels that he can always leave. . . . Similarly, discontent rather than sober choice causes him to choose new jobs."

Our rather romantic view of every child laborer as a potential "self-made man" does not hold water in our present industrial organization. Those who hold to it forget, first, that industry is now organized on a larger scale and with a higher degree of specialization than when most of our self-made men were children; and second, that for every successful self-made man there have always been thousands of industrial failures. Raymond G. Fuller remarks, "When we come to think of it, in Dr. Crother's suggestive phrase, we know that nobody succeeds in life without opportunities or advantages of some kind—unusual parents, maybe, or unusual ability. . . . No man ever succeeded because of child labor, but rather in spite of it; no man because of the lack of rightful opportunities and advantages of children. . . . We boast about our self-made men, but Ward's studies of achievement show conclusively that self-made men are rare or non-existent, and that 'all who have succeeded have done so by virtue of some form of opportunity.'

He listed among the chief environmental factors favoring success, 'careful and prolonged intellectual training during youth, whereby all the fields of achievement become familiar and choice of them possible in harmony with intellectual proclivities and tastes.' "

Health—Overwork and strain naturally produce overfatigue and predispose the child worker to disease. Dr. Teleky, of Vienna, some years ago made a study of children in school and at work, which showed the immediate increase of morbidity among children who left school for work. In a group of one hundred thirteen-year-old children in school, there were 22 cases of sickness. When, at fourteen, the children went to work, there were, among the one hundred, 41 cases of sickness, and the sickness rate remained at 39, 40 or 41 during the next three years of their employment. "Work in some way almost doubled the morbidity in that group of one hundred children."

Children are more susceptible to occupational disease than adults, and they are two or three times as liable to industrial accident. Our dangerous-trades laws, forbidding the employment of children in hazardous occupations or processes, are based on this fact, but the continued high accident rate for children in industry and the presence of occupational diseases among child workers indicate that we have not yet protected them fully. A recent study of accidents in Connecticut showed that the accident rate per one hundred employees was 37.1 for workers under fifteen years of age; 42.9 for workers between fifteen and twenty; and the average for all other age groups only 21.6, even though children are now very unfrequently employed at dangerous machines.

While we have very few examinations of working chil-

dren *after* they have entered industry in this country, and consequently know little of the effects of occupations or the presence of occupational disease among them, every examination that has been made shows considerable occupational or other disease. Of 1500 children in twelve Baltimore industries who were examined on changing their jobs, 100 were found to have diseases directly traceable to occupation. Furthermore, the children themselves frequently gave as their reasons for changing employment conditions of their work which brought on physical discomfort or illness. "Too dusty," they said, or "too hard on the eyes or hands," or "too heavy."

Dr. Edsall says that one great weakness in our attempts to provide health protection for child workers lies in the fact that while we forbid all children to enter certain hazardous occupations, we take few steps to see that a child with a minor physical defect which may be aggravated by a particular kind of work, does not do that kind of work. The child with weak eyes, for instance, should certainly not go into a job which involves eye-strain. And a child who shows any tendency to tuberculosis, even though he be well, should not go into a cotton mill, to grinding metals or to any other dusty trade. But our physical examinations of children applying for work permits very seldom go into this phase of the question; they are general, and usually the examining officer really knows little about the real conditions of the industry which the child intends to enter. This is one of the reasons, together with the fact that we know so little of the health of children in industry, why the Children's Bureau committee on this subject has called attention to the "need of study by local administrative and medical offi-

cers of occupations in which children are employed and of their effect upon health," and the "need of authoritative scientific investigation as to the effect of different kinds of work upon the health and physique of the adolescent child." Besides this scientific investigation, physical examinations which will assure us that a child's work is suited to his physical equipment and periodic examinations of all child workers are essential to health protection for working children.

Child labor is also known to have an effect upon mental as well as physical health. The Children's Bureau says, "Chronic maladies of nutrition and of the nervous system, especially, are common among working-children. The necessity for speed frequently results in nervous exhaustion." Professor E. C. Sanford, of Clark University says, "There is in my judgment no question that a normal childhood would have reduced the percentage of neurasthenic and neurotic conditions uncovered by the draft. In such normal childhood properly developed play is a very essential point."

Play—That child labor is a denial of normal play is obvious enough, and we are increasingly aware of the importance of play in a child's development. Norsworthy and Whitley, in *The Psychology of Childhood,* say, "A child who does not play, not only misses much of the joy of childhood, but he can never be a fully developed adult. He will lack in many of the qualities most worth while because many of the avenues of growth were unused and neglected during the most plastic period of his life." The abnormal mental and nervous conditions that may result are suggested above.

Play is so instinctive for a child, however, that many

child workers play even on their jobs. Many industrial accidents to children are directly attributable to this play instinct. Much of the industrial instability of child workers comes from this same cause, and the employer who says a child is "not much good" as an employee because he is always playing, offers an excellent fundamental argument against child labor; the child was never meant for a laborer. In all his characteristics he remains a child, no matter what adult task he attempts, and as a child he needs play. If he is not given play, he takes it.

Fatigue, mechanical tasks, speeding-up and long hours drive the working-child to the wrong kinds of recreation in his leisure. "The social use of leisure" is a phrase that we hear a good deal of today, and child labor certainly does not lead to such use of leisure. We deplore the rush of young people to melodramatic, over-exciting movies, to dance-halls and pool-rooms, but what else can we expect as a reaction from confining tasks during working hours which leave little energy for physical development or intellectual excursions? Keeping young children out of industry not only provides a means of educating them in wholesome games and recreational possibilities, but lessens their desire for "excitement."

Delinquency—The old adage as to Satan and the idle hands does not seem to hold for child laborers. It may be true that "it is better for a child to work than to be idle," but the fact remains that the child laborer contributes far more than his share of juvenile delinquency. The federal report on "The Condition of Women and Child Wage-earners" long ago proved this fact. The records of 4,839 delinquent children were studied. The working

children were responsible for 62 per cent of the offenses among these six to sixteen-year-old children. "When it is remembered that a majority, and presumably a large majority, of all children between these ages are not working, this preponderance of offenses among workers assumes impressive proportions." Only one fifth of the workers as compared with one third of the non-workers came from distinctly bad homes. "Conditions do not vary widely between the two groups. They come from the same classes and approach pretty nearly to the same general level of well-being. It seems rather difficult to escape the conclusion that being at work had something to do with their going wrong."

A recent study of juvenile delinquency in Manhattan showed that "working children contribute four times their share to the ranks of juvenile delinquency." Another recent study in Dallas showed that "newsboys contribute to delinquency two and three fourths times the percentage that prevails in the boy population as a whole."

We cannot put our hands on the exact thing about child labor that produces this tendency to delinquency, but the mental and nervous maladjustments caused by fatigue and confinement to routine undoubtedly have something to do with it. The sudden freedom from school and family rules, the apparent independence of the wage-earner, may also contribute to it, together with the influences the children meet, especially in messenger and delivery services, street-selling and other street trades.

The tendency of the child to shift from job to job and to be drifting about during the period between jobs undoubtedly contributes to delinquency as well as to irresponsibility and general character deterioration. It has

been estimated that because of this continual shifting of child workers with the resultant unemployment during the process of finding a new job, only about half the child laborers in this country are employed at any given time. In Maryland, where it was found that in two years 228 Baltimore children had held 1,686 different positions, the average time unemployed between jobs was about one month per child. In Illinois, the time actually employed among 4,000 children was found to be only half the time out of school; that is, a child who had been out of school six months on a work permit might have been actually employed only three months.

Professor Douglas says of this situation, "The period of idleness between positions, which has been shown to be so large, is another evil factor in the child's industrial life. He is neither at work nor at school; he is industrially adrift. Unemployment for adults is bad enough; for children it is positively vicious. It breaks down habits of industry which are slowly forming and exposes them to all sorts of positive dangers."

Present Child Labor Conditions

As has been stated, the Census of 1920 enumerates 1,060,858 children between the ages of ten and sixteen gainfully employed in the United States. This is a distinct decrease from the figures of the 1910 Census and indicates that our campaigns against child labor have been at least partially successful. Although there was an increase of 15 per cent in the total child population, ten to fifteen years of age, inclusive, the number of children gainfully employed decreased by 46.7 per cent. In the majority of occupations, although the total number of

workers increased, both the number and proportion of children at work decreased and in every group except public service the proportion of increase was less or the proportion of decrease greater among the child laborers than among the working groups as a whole.

According to the Census Bureau the probable explanations for this decrease are three:—

(1) Change in the census date from April 15 in 1910 to January 1 in 1920, explaining chiefly the great decrease in numbers engaged in agriculture, because farmwork is practically at a standstill on January 1st, and naturally fewer children would then be employed than on April 15th, when farmwork is beginning again.

(2) A relative over-enumeration in 1910. In 1910 there was much more emphasis placed upon the enumeration of child workers than in either 1900 or 1920. It is believed by the Census Bureau, therefore, that the apparent increase of child-workers especially in agriculture in 1910 over 1900, and some of the decrease recorded in the same pursuits in 1920, may be due to this over-enumeration in 1910, when the census enumerators may have classified as gainfully employed, children who did chores on the home farm, not so classified in either 1900 or 1920. However, enumerators in all three censuses were instructed not to return as gainfully employed such children, and the Children's Bureau suggests that their investigations indicate that the differences in figures for agricultural child labor were not due to over-enumeration in 1910, but to under-enumeration in 1900 and 1920. The Children's Bureau findings in farming areas studied, which covered parts of New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, Michigan, Colorado and Texas, would indicate that the proportion of children employed as farm laborers for the whole or part of the farm season is considerably greater than the proportion reported even by the 1910 census.

(3) Increased legal restrictions affecting child labor, better compulsory education laws, and more efficient administration of these two classes of laws.

These legal and administrative changes would have little effect on child labor in agriculture, because, except as affected by compulsory education laws, agricultural child labor is unregulated. In non-agricultural pursuits, however, the decrease of 26 per cent in the number of child workers in 1920 as contrasted with an increase of 20 per cent in the total number of persons employed, is largely attributable to these changes, that is, to our legislative and administrative campaigns against child labor.

Between 1910 and 1920, the age limits for child labor were increased or made to include more occupations in at least half the states, and further strengthened in the educational or physical requirements for work permits in many states. The number of states fixing maximum hours for children increased from seven to twenty-eight in this decade, and the states having no night work prohibition for children decreased from twenty-three to seven. In 1910 there were seven states which had no compulsory education laws, while in 1920 every state had such a law. Continuation school or part-time school laws were passed in twenty-two states in this decade and undoubtedly had an effect on the number of children employed.

Indeed, our legislative and administrative regulation of industrial child labor has steadily improved. The National Child Labor Committee says that whereas in 1904, at the time of the Committee's organization, only fourteen states had a fourteen-year age limit for factories, forty-five states had such a law in 1921; only one state had an eight-hour day for children under sixteen in 1904, while thirty-two had such laws in 1921; and only five states prohibited night work by children under sixteen in 1904, while forty-one states prohibited it in 1921.

Federal Child Labor Regulation

The decrease in child labor in manufacturing and mechanical occupations between 1910 and 1920 is also attributable to the federal laws which were in force during the latter part of the decade. The first federal law was in force from September 1, 1917 to June 3, 1918, when it was declared unconstitutional, and the second, or tax law, from April 25, 1919 to May 15, 1922, when it too was declared unconstitutional. Since, when this second federal law was declared unconstitutional in May, 1922, only thirteen states had laws measuring up to the federal standard in every particular, it is obvious that the two laws, having similar standards, must have had an immediate effect on the numbers of children employed all over the country.

It is also true that the federal child labor laws had considerable influence in the improvement of state laws. In the six years since the passage of the first federal law (passed in 1916, operative one year later) three states have passed night-work prohibitions for children under sixteen, eight states have passed eight-hour laws for children under sixteen, and twenty-one states have passed a sixteen-year age limit for employment in mines.

Yet, as has been said, there are only thirteen states which measure up to the federal standard in every particular. In three states children under fourteen may be employed in factories; in seventeen states children under sixteen may work more than eight hours a day; and in seven states children under sixteen may work at night. And this is the chief argument in favor of federal regulation of child labor—that the states themselves have not

and do not come up to what we have considered our national standard. As Owen R. Lovejoy has said, "Twice the people of this country, through their representatives in Congress, have sought to express their wish and will in the form of a federal child labor law, and twice their humane and patriotic purpose has fallen to naught by reason of constitutional limitations as set forth in decisions of the United States Supreme Court. It has been published to the world that the United States of America cannot protect its children in industry. . . . A nation that cannot protect its own children from industrial exploitation should be ashamed of itself. It should at least have the power to do so, even though it use the power only to make up the deficiencies of state action and to set up a minimum standard of national decency which no state shall be allowed to abrogate. . . . There is no democracy in permitting backward localities to use up childhood."

There are, of course, two ways of attacking the problem of making our "national standards" really national. The first is, to concentrate on bringing the backward states up to standard, and this is the method advocated by those who believe that any federal child labor law is an attack on the principle of states' rights and leads the way to further federal regulation of industrial conditions within the states. It is an obvious method of attack and sounds simple, considering the apparent strength of public opinion on the side of the "standards." But unfortunately, the states where the laws are weak are the ones where there is the strongest tradition in favor of child labor, the greatest number of apologists for it on the grounds of expediency, of the needs of industry, of poverty, and so on. And the whole history of child labor reform is testimony

to the length of time and the amount of energy and hard campaigning it takes to change tradition and prejudice in the interests of child labor laws. Meantime the harmful employment of children goes on with its resultant industrial and social waste.

This, together with the feeling that child welfare is a national concern, is the reason for turning to the second method of attack, an amendment to the Constitution making federal regulation of child labor possible. The advocates of this method are many. The American Federation of Labor, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Board of the Y. W. C. A., The International Committee of the Y. M. C. A., many women's clubs and legislative councils, including the General Federation, the National Congress of Mothers, and the American Association of University Women; the National Child Labor Committee, the Children's and Women's Bureaus of the Department of Labor; and a large number of newspapers and periodicals all over the country have demanded such a Constitutional amendment. Their argument is that the welfare of children cannot be bounded on geographical lines, and that it is clear that the states cannot be depended upon to safeguard their children properly. The New York *Globe,* which says, "It is plain that a Constitution drafted in 1791, before the rise of the factory system, is not adequate to meet the necessities of a nation as completely industrialized as is the United States of 1922," holds that "it is absurd that this nation should now have no legal authority to interfere with conditions injurious to the health or morals of the coming generation. For if a nation cannot defend its young, it cannot assure its own existence." The San Francisco *Journal* says, "By

two recent amendments to the Constitution, measures have been taken to make the poisonous liquor traffic a matter of national concern and to secure national recognition of the rights of women as citizens. If we do not regard the rights of children as an equally important issue and of equal concern to the nation as a whole, our boasted idealism is a rather hollow affair." And although we have long considered the South to be the home of child labor as well as of the chief upholders of states' rights, several Southern papers, also, have joined in the call for a Constitutional amendment on the ground, as the Jackson, Mississippi, *Clarion* says, that child labor "is more than a state interest. It is a national interest and it will be very unfortunate if the evil is allowed to continue."

Senator Medill McCormick introduced a resolution for a Constitutional amendment in the Senate, July 26, 1922, which reads, "The Congress shall have power to limit or prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age, and power is also reserved to the several states to limit or prohibit such labor in any way which does not lessen any limitation of such labor or the extent of any prohibition thereof by Congress. The power vested in the Congress by this article shall be additional to and not a limitation on the powers elsewhere vested in the Congress by the Constitution with respect to such labor."[1] This not only gives Congress the power to fix a minimum standard for child labor in the United States, but leaves the way open for the states to fix higher standards if they wish. Nor does it make it *necessary* for Congress to fix the standard, for there are many people who believe, in the light of the immediate improvement of many state

[1] No action on this or any similar proposal was taken by the Congress which ended March 3, 1923.

laws after the passage of the first federal law, that the mere recognition of the fact that there is a national demand for a standard will be enough to bring the backward states into line. Owen R. Lovejoy says, "It may turn out that a Constitutional amendment will be all the federal protection necessary; or in other words, that the states, knowing that Congress can do the job, will themselves give full protection to America's children. If they do, legislation by Congress will not be needed; but in any case, *Congress should have the power to act.*"

It must be remembered, however, that each of the two federal child labor laws affected only a small proportion of the child laborers in this country, approximately fifteen per cent, that is, those in factories, canneries, workshops, mines and quarries—the occupations which we are very sure are harmful to young children. But the children in agriculture, domestic service, street trades, tenements, stores, messenger and delivery service, restaurants and hotels, moving picture companies and theaters were outside their scope, and they represent, numerically at least, a far larger problem. Shall we come to federal regulation of these occupations also? Do the states look after them? Or are they really a lesser problem with small effect on the welfare of children?

Agriculture

Sixty-one per cent (647,309) of the children between ten and sixteen who are gainfully employed in the United States are engaged in agriculture, and since every investigation shows many children under ten so employed, there must be thousands of these younger children at work but not included in the Census. Yet in no state in the Union

is agricultural child labor regulated, save as it is affected by compulsory education laws, which are notoriously weak of enforcement in the country and apply to child labor only during school hours.

But why, if for years so many children have been employed in agriculture, not only on the home farm, but for persons other than their parents, have we completely neglected them in our laws, and why do we know so little about them? Chiefly, because we have long believed that farm-work was healthful or at least harmless, and partly, because, knowing the independence and isolation of rural workers, we have felt that regulation of agriculture would be impossible and that any laws passed would be unenforced, or openly violated.

Yet our rural school situation and our rural health situation have waked us up, and we are surprised to discover what we should have known, that agriculture has been largely industrialized, that even on the home farm this industrialization has taken out of the children's work much of the educative value that used to be there. Charles E. Gibbons says of child labor on tenant-farms in Tennessee, "The kinds of work the children are called upon to do in the one-crop sections is not training them to be any better farmers than their parents. It is mere drudgery and wholly uneducational. It does not teach them thrift and economy, for the parents, as a rule, get all the returns from their labor; in fact their labor is simply a 'board and keep' proposition. Out of 112 tenant parents in Tennessee only 18 reported their children owning anything, such as a pig, calf, acre of corn, cotton, etc., and receiving the profits therefrom. There is nothing in this drudgery that centers interest in the farm."

One of the worst features of the situation is the evidence that children in rural districts are definitely regarded as *labor supply,* and hence open to exploitation at the expense of school, recreation and health. "The larger the family, the larger the farm that is operated." In one-crop sections under the tenancy system, the size of the farm allotted to a tenant depends definitely on the size of his family. In the beet fields of Michigan and Colorado, acreage is allotted on the same basis, and families with several children are frankly demanded by the employers. The same view of children as labor supply holds in Texas cotton fields, California cotton and asparagus fields, Ohio onion fields, and so on.

Of California asparagus fields, the Sacramento *Star* reports, "Children not yet in their teens . . . work. Some are only nine or ten years old. They work ten or twelve hours a day. Their bosses often are Chinese or Hindus. They live in miserable shanties, many crowded into a room. Their pay is low. *They make asparagus growing profitable.*"

In Massachusetts, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children reported in the fall of 1921 that children from ten years old upward were employed in the Connecticut Valley tobacco fields, stripping and stringing leaves in canvas sheds for nine and a half to ten hours a day. The sheds were very hot and the children, girls and women worked standing for a full nine and a half hours. The Industrial Inspector reported: "I know that the sight of so many children working in the fields during the heat is repugnant to folks who are interested in preventing the exploitation of child labor, but the work in which they are engaged is on a farm or in sheds in connection with a

farm and *as such is not a violation of the existing statutes governing child labor.*"

Of Ohio onion and celery fields a Cleveland paper reported that many children between eight and fourteen were working ten hours a day under a speeding-up system,—weeding, crawling on hands and knees, so that they became completely exhausted. The reporter said, "Whether it's lawful or not, I can't help but feel that child labor such as I saw is wrong." An Ohio official who also investigated called the conditions "outrageous and unbelievable." Charles E. Gibbons, who studied these same onion-field workers found that many of the families came to Ohio from Kentucky for the work about April first, and stayed until the middle of November. The children got no schooling whatever in Ohio and only a little in Kentucky. Recently the Ohio officials have announced that they believe that under the state school law the labor of children under fourteen can be stopped as the attorney-general regards it as a "commercialized and industrialized employment." At any rate, Ohio seems to be awake to the situation.

The educational results of such agricultural child labor as has been described are very clear, especially when we remember that much of this work goes on, not merely during school vacations, but while the schools are actually in session, and that, on the other hand, rural schools frequently close in the interests of farm-work for longer or shorter periods during a rush season.

But the thing that we are apt to forget is that, in spite of the fact that the work is done in the open air, it may result in physical strain or bodily defects. Of an investi-

gation by the Children's Bureau in Colorado beet fields, Miss Grace Abbott says:

More than half the child workers . . . were between the ages of nine and twelve, inclusive, and the average age was eleven years. These young children thinned out the small plants in the spring, hoed, pulled up the beets when grown, and finally "topped" them. "Pulling" requires considerable physical effort, for the matured beets weigh from two to two and three fourths and sometimes as much as eight or nine pounds; in "topping" (cutting off the top) a certain amount of danger is involved, especially for the younger children, as the work is done with a long sharp knife hooked at the end. Physically, however, the most harmful feature of the work probably lies in the long continued strain. From 65 to 85 per cent of the children . . . worked nine hours or more per day, but the working day was sometimes thirteen or fourteen hours. The continued stooping in kneeling and crouching positions when "thinning" and the lifting and handling of heavy weights in "pulling" and "topping" affects, the evidence indicates, the posture and outline of the growing child's body. Of more than 1,000 children who were examined, 70 per cent . . . had postural deformities and malpositions apparently due to strain. . . . Of the entire group, 66.1 per cent show winged scapulæ, indicating that in two children out of every three the muscles of the back were unable to sustain the weights they were called upon to bear during the period of growth. . . . Flat-foot was noted . . . among 21.6 per cent of the children examined. Flat-foot percentage among well children is quoted at 6 per cent and among dispensary cases (children), 9 per cent, so that this high rate among the children employed in beet fields appears to be the result of the straining upon immature muscles.

E. C. Lindeman, basing his conclusions on studies of farm men in army camps and comparisons both in physical stamina and mental alertness of city-reared and farm-reared men, especially in relation to their reactions to play, says:

Notwithstanding the fact that farmwork provides for an abundance of physical exercise in the open air, observation seems to indicate that: (a) Farm boys and girls do not develop symmetrically. (b) The work of the farm seems to overdevelop the major or fundamental muscles while the finer or accessory muscles are neglected. (c) Farm life in general does not produce a degree of mental alertness and neuro-muscular coordination essential to an enthusiastic and optimistic outlook on life.

Much has been said of the lack of opportunities for play and recreation in rural districts, but nowhere does this lack have more serious results than in connection with agricultural child labor. We think of the country child as playing happily about the farm and in the woods. But what chances for play has the child who works from nine to thirteen hours a day, weeding or hoeing or harvesting, not spasmodically, but as a "hand" who must cover just so many rows or turn in just so many pounds of produce?

The worst of the situation is that this excessive child labor comes not only from economic necessity, but from the attitude of the parent who regards his child as labor supply, thinks very little of schooling, and has such small regard for play that he may even consider it harmful. Poverty is, of course, a cause of child labor on the farm as elsewhere, and there are many American farms, especially under the tenancy system where it is literally true that every member of the family must work to make ends meet. For the multitudes of such cases every form of economic relief for the farmer must be encouraged.

But poverty does not explain the case of the man who was well enough off to own a two-hundred-acre farm but kept his six-, eight- and ten-year-old children out of school for work during the beet season just the same, or the

man who kept his seven- and eleven-year-old children out of school for work in the beet fields, although he had made $10,000 the year before, or the man whose children worked regularly, and who remarked with satisfaction, "Yes, ours is a profitable bunch." Walter Armentrout says in *Rural Child Welfare,* "Many children are still compelled by their parents to work, not from necessity, but because they honestly believe that work is the only thing worth while for them. They are prejudiced against play, recreation and social life, and cannot see the value of an education if it interferes with their immediate needs, so they often require children to work to keep them out of 'divilment.'"

There is no doubt that farmwork can be one of the most educative and valuable forms of work for children, and that it can have a tremendous effect in raising the standards of agriculture and leading young people to stay in it, instead of running away to industry, wherever farmwork is so given to children as to create interest in the farm. But agricultural child labor as now generally practised has lost sight of the educative features of work and reduced itself too often to the monotony of any mechanical task. The argument of the child labor reformer is not that children should not work on farms, but that *the work they are now doing* is largely exploitative and has all the harmful characteristics of child labor everywhere. If we are interested in America and in raising the standards of rural life, as we say we are, one of our first points of attack must be agricultural child labor, because it is tending to produce a very poor and uneducated new generation in our rural districts.

Migratory Workers

As has been said, families working in the Ohio onion fields migrate from Kentucky at certain seasons for the work. In the same way, families of workers in the beet fields of Michigan and Colorado are "imported" in the spring for the beet season and assigned a tract of land, the acreage of which depends on the number of workers in the family. In California asparagus and cotton fields, families are imported. "The agent ascertains that a certain family has, for instance, six children old enough to work. He contracts with their father for eight asparagus cutters—the children and their parents. No mention is made in the contract of the fact that six of the cutters are children."

In Mississippi shrimp and oyster canneries it has long been the custom to import families from Baltimore, for instance, for the season, which may run from October to May. One manager described the practice as follows: "I usually go up to Baltimore myself in September or October, when the workers are coming in from the tomato and corn canneries and have their goods all packed up. They stay around Baltimore about a week and are brought to our train with their stuff packed." The Children's Bureau investigated conditions among these families in 1919 and found that 64 per cent of the children worked regularly in the canneries, 278 of these 544 working-children being below the legal age for work in canneries in the states in which they were employed. And 41 per cent of the children in these families, seven to thirteen years of age, did not attend school, 106 children never having been to school anywhere.

Whether the children work or not—and the chances are good for their working since there is little else for them to do in these temporary settlements—there are two by-products of the fact of migration which do the children much harm; first, by moving from place to place, whether they work or not, they lose their chance of regular schooling; and second, the housing and sanitary conditions in their camps or settlements are very poor, and the younger children, even the babies, must either be taken to the fields or canneries with their mothers or left in these unhealthful surroundings without care during the day.

There have been attempts to limit or prohibit this importation of labor. Some employers, in fact, claim that they find it on the whole unsatisfactory. It has been said, also, that families with children should not be so employed, but it would be difficult to make such a rule compulsory. So far as the children are concerned, the emphasis must be on the enforcement of school laws and of child labor laws wherever they apply. California, discovering the evils of migratory labor in her cotton and asparagus fields, has resorted to migratory teachers and portable schools to follow the children and make the laws enforceable. Ohio, as has been said, feels that its school laws can be enforced even in the case of children from Kentucky who live there temporarily. In any case, states and communities where migratory workers gather have a responsibility in their care. Schooling must be provided for the children; housing must be made decent; and employers must be held responsible for violations of child labor laws.

Street Traders

Owen R. Lovejoy calls street trading "a neglected form of child labor." We are so used to seeing children selling papers, or peddling chewing gum, or blacking boots, or otherwise working on the streets, that although we have heard that it is not good for them, we think little about it and do less. Twenty-one states have some regulation for street trading by children, but the age limits fixed are often so low that a ten-year-old boy may legally work on the streets, and further, the laws are so poorly enforced that boys as young as six or seven are found street trading in almost every city. We are apt to look at these small boys and think, "Aren't they cunning!" or "How good of them to help their poor families!" But Mr. Lovejoy's statement that "In no less than twenty-five cities the National Child Labor Committee has followed up children engaged in street trades and in each city without exception found among them the same tendency to delinquency, to poor school work, and to be influenced by unwholesome surroundings," suggests that we might well think more seriously of them.

What of this idea that the street-worker is "helping his poor family" and consequently should be allowed to work? In the first place, it should be noted that the average earnings of newsboys, at least, are very low —five cents a day in Cincinnati, fifty-four cents a day in Connecticut cities, with 65 per cent of the boys earning less than fifty cents a day and 26 per cent less than twenty-five cents, so that the amount of help they can give their families is slight. In the second place, investigation shows that their earnings are usually spent

upon themselves. In Pittsburg only one sixth of the newsboys contribute anything to their families. In Birmingham 46 per cent spend all their own earnings and usually without supervision—on movies, candy, sodas or crap games. In Mobile, 66 per cent contribute nothing to their families. In Springfield, 55 per cent do contribute to their families, but in not all cases is the assistance either necessary or of great help. In fact, Hexter's findings in Cincinnati seem to summarize the financial status of newsboys everywhere. He found that 81 per cent of the boys came from families with both parents living; that only 9.2 per cent of the families were in actual need of the child's earnings; that only 4.2 per cent of the families were so poor as to have received aid from relief agencies; that 19.2 per cent of the families were well enough off to own their own homes; and that "the actual number of cases in which newsboys have helped their families to achieve a normal standard of living when they would have been unable to attain it without such help is very small. . . . In the complexity of motives actuating the rather large entry of children into the newspaper trade, poverty plays a very minor rôle. . . . The families of newsboys represent a comparatively high stratum of our population."

But, we are told, "Many of our famous men began their careers as newsboys. It teaches boys independence and helps them to get on in life." Some cynic has remarked that if we had a list of our famous men who began as newsboys, we might easily balance it by a list of other "famous men" in jails and penitentiaries who also began as newsboys, and certainly to the total of juvenile delinquency the street trader contributes more

than his share. In Birmingham in 1920 it was found that 75 per cent of the boys with juvenile court records had been newsboys for more than two years. Of the boys then selling on the streets, 28 per cent smoked, 10 per cent were habitual gamblers, 14 per cent frequently played truant, 12 per cent were known to be troublesome on the street, 6 per cent had been caught stealing, and 8 per cent had already been before the juvenile court. This is not an unusual record; it has been practically duplicated wherever careful investigation has been made. Nor is it unnatural for children to "go wrong" under the influences which they must meet in their "independence" as workers on city streets.

Street work if not prohibited for children, should be regulated. There should be a definite and reasonable age-limit for such work, and night work by children on the streets should be prohibited. Every street worker should be licensed, the license preferably being given by school authorities on the basis of a school and physical record, and revocable for unsatisfactory school work or other sufficient cause.

Home Work

The National Consumers League long ago taught most of us the evils of home work in city tenements. But home work still goes on, in fact, is spreading out of the larger cities to smaller towns. Laws prohibiting child labor in tenement home work are very difficult of enforcement. Inspectors cannot watch every home all the time, and so long as the work is there, the children are likely to do it. School laws may prevent their working during school hours, but they do not prevent their working be-

fore and after school, to the detriment, of course, of school work as well as their health. There are no enforceable age limits for home work, no limits on hours of labor, and no pay for overtime. Starvation wages are paid, but the system continues because the families need the pay and the employers save on rent, fuel and overhead charges by means of it.

In a study in New York City by Mrs. Mary Schonberg for the Woman's City Club, it was found that nearly half the workers earned five dollars or less a week. Ten cents a gross is the price paid for pasting two backs and a string on a paper bell, plus counting and packing the articles. Sorting snap-fasteners and snapping them on cards is almost entirely children's work in New York tenements, and the pay for snapping twelve gross of fasteners is fifteen cents. Carding hooks and eyes, three dozen on a card, pays four to seven cents a gross, and "the eye-strain in this work is severe."

But New York is not the only place where home work exists. It has spread rapidly in recent years, even out of cities to towns. In Rhode Island the Children's Bureau recently found the system to be wide-spread. Of 2,300 children who had done home work for at least a month, 4 per cent were under six years and 46 per cent under eleven. The children worked not only after school in the afternoon, but at night, some of them exclusively at night. A few of the older children were factory or store workers by day and home workers at night. Of the children who reported earnings, four fifths could not earn ten cents an hour at the rates paid, and one half could not earn five cents an hour, even working at top speed.

Home work in all its aspects is un-American. Its workers have no protection against exploitation, and the consumers of its products have no protection against the health hazards known to exist. Its worst features from the workers' point of view are represented in the manufacturer who says, "That's the price I pay. If you don't like it, I can get other workers." For the low wage is based on the knowledge that poor families will accept any wage and any conditions of work to earn a few more dollars.

Home work, apparently, cannot be regulated: it must be prohibited. This does not mean simply that child labor in home work must be prohibited, for that has been tried and found impossible of enforcement. The whole practice of giving out factory work to homes must be stopped to remedy the evils. In Rhode Island the manufacturers testified that by making certain factory adjustments, home work could be stopped. In New York the manufacturers feel it must go on. But there seems to be little justice in prolonging a system that has been proved to be economically and socially harmful to so many people, among them hundreds of small children.

Age Limits

The Children's Bureau committee on physical standards for working children says:

> The minimum age for the entrance of children into industry should be not younger than sixteen years. Since it is recognized that the physiological and psychological readjustments incident to pubescence (which in the vast majority of cases are not completed until the sixteenth year) determine a period of general

instability which makes great and special demands upon the vitality of the child, it is of paramount importance that he should be protected during this period from the physical and nervous strain which entrance into industry inevitably entails. The committee recognizes the fact that pubescence may occur early or may be very greatly delayed, and is convinced that the longer it is delayed, the stronger is the indication of a physical stage during which it is highly inappropriate to subject the child to the strains of industry.

Whatever our view on this subject, it must be recognized that no hard and fast age limit can be fully protective without other requirements. There must be first an educational requirement: the child who has completed only a few grades in school, or is illiterate, is not ready to become a wage-earner even though he is fourteen or fifteen. If he is mentally defective, special care and training are what he needs, not unsupervised entrance into the industrial world. And there must be, also, a physical requirement. It is recognized that chronological age and physiological age are two different things, that a boy of fifteen may easily be so under-developed physically as to be unfit for labor, while another boy of fourteen may be far more fit. That is, a definite physical standard must back up every age law if we are to protect children against industrial health hazards. More than that, we must carry our principle of excluding children from certain hazardous occupations further, and assure ourselves through careful physical examinations for work permits that any given child will be excluded from the trades which may be hazardous for him with his special physical weaknesses or disabilities.

Methods of Combating Child Labor

Legislation—This is the method we have used most generally, both in child labor and school laws, and it is effective up to a certain point. But it is not enough to pass a law if public opinion or economic conditions make it unenforceable, and it is not enough to forbid a child's working if you give him nothing instead. Other methods must go hand in hand with legislative regulation.

Substitution—School laws and educational requirements are based on the desire to substitute schooling for child labor. A mere school law will not do it, however, as we want it done, unless the schools are efficient and alive enough to give the child what he needs. Better schools must be an accompaniment of child labor reform, and will to a certain degree effect that reform insofar as they succeed in interesting the child in education rather than wage-earning. In the same way, better opportunities for play and for educative work go hand in hand with child labor reform. We must not only provide the right activities for the child when we forbid him to labor, but we must create valuable interests for him that will make too early wage-earning lose its charm.

Economic method—But all these efforts are useless wherever child labor is made imperative by poverty—and many people believe that child labor is caused wholly by poverty. Certainly the relation between low income and child labor is so clear as to need no proof. Yet child labor and poverty, if let alone, are largely self-perpetuating, the one breeding the other for generation after generation. And most of us believe that from the point of view of social development, poverty is no

justification for a state's or a nation's allowing its children's opportunities to be cut off. "No state or nation can afford such a sacrifice."

The immediate way to combat poverty is to give relief to poor families where children would have to work without that relief, and this may be done either through mothers' pensions and private family relief, or through children's scholarships to allow poor children to stay in school rather than go to work. But the more fundamental attack on poverty is to increase and stabilize the family income itself. This does not mean the obvious, but apparently difficult, campaign for a "living wage." It means interest in every economic measure that will affect the income and purchasing power of adults. The reduction of unemployment, workmen's compensation, price-fixing and the improvement of distribution and marketing, even health measures and health insurance, must be of interest to the child welfare worker who sees the economic problem in its broadest view.

But, actually, we are given to over-emphasizing the economic causes of child labor. Poverty is a cause of child labor, but it is far from true that it is the only cause. Our school-leaving statistics show that from fifty to sixty per cent of the children who leave school for work do so for reasons other than poverty. The Children's Bureau assigns to poverty from one third to one fourth of the cases of child labor, and gives as other causes the failure of the schools to serve and hold children, and the ignorance of children, parents, teachers, employers and the public of the real effects of child labor and of the value of education, the right kinds of work and play.

Education of the Public—Since this is true, and considering the difficulties which prejudice and tradition throw in the way of child labor reform, public education, and parental education especially, toward an understanding of the needs of children is one of the chief concerns of child labor reform. "The gospel of childhood" is what the child labor reformer is trying to preach, and a reverence for childhood, a belief in it, an understanding of its peculiar characteristics and rights, a realization that childhood must not be used up for material and immediate ends, are essential to real child-development.

I was brought up on a song which we used to sing both in the little church and also in the little schoolhouse across the road on the prairies, every stanza of which, as I recall, ended with the refrain that urged us to work because the night was coming. We sang joyfully of work while the "dew was sparkling," of work "'mid springing flowers," of work even "through the sunny noon," and of work "till the last beam fadeth, fadeth to shine no more." The only sad line was the last line which reminded us of the coming of the night, when man could "work no more." But it was a happy song, for all the work was as play, had in it the joy of achieving, of perfecting the things we were working on, as the workman mentioned in that wonderful essay in "Ecclesiasticus" on Labor and Leisure, of expressing ourselves and realizing the most of which we are capable. Work should have in it the zest of Pippa's New Year song, "O day, if I squander one wavelet of thee!"

VI

Children and Schools

Historically, our system of education is a new institution. Compared with the Church, for instance, the public school is in mere infancy. Although the principle of free, universal education was embodied in the colonial laws of Massachusetts and Connecticut, it was not until nearly the middle of the nineteenth century that schools, supported by taxes and controlled by the states, were generally established. More than that, although we think of our educational system as universal and compulsory, it is actually only within the last few years that every state in the Union has had on its statute books a law for state-wide compulsory education, and even now these laws differ widely in age-requirements, school-term requirements and possible exceptions.

This comparative newness of the system explains not only many of its weaknesses, but the fact that at certain points we seem to have taken it on faith. Any new institution, based on apparently sound principles, hailed as progressive and widely established, is apt to be regarded for a time as efficient: the mere fact of its establishment seems in the popular mind to be a guarantee of efficiency. As Dorothy Canfield Fisher has put it, the American public school has been like a new and amazing machine, and "we have been charmed by its novelty into expecting a great deal more of it than any machine can accomplish. . . . The school is about as new as the lawn-mowing machine. And like the lawn-mower, it

accomplishes with a vast economy of time and effort a great deal more than was dreamed possible in olden times. . . . We have been so enchanted and interested by the cheerful clatter of the wheels and blades and by the smooth, level results of the work that we have stood gaping in admiration too long without realizing that it is our lawns that are being thus brought into shape, and that the machine can take no responsibility save to finish what we present." It might be suggested, also that we have forgotten temporarily that every machine needs oiling and repair from time to time as well as guidance in the right direction or in new directions.

But we seem to-day to be taking a close and critical view of the machine and to be initiating repairs and improvements with commendable energy. It is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper or periodical without finding an article on "What Is Wrong with Our Schools?" or "The Fallacies of Modern Education," and if we believe all the criticisms, a great deal is wrong with the schools, in spite of the fact that we are tinkering with the machine, experimenting and improving it all the time.

Boiled down to their essence, the chief criticisms are:

(1) That the system is not even mechanically perfect in that it does not actually reach all children. As the Superintendent of the Evansville schools says, "the schools are not educating nine tenths of the children whom they are supposed to serve."

(2) That the results, even with the children who do attend school, are unsatisfactory. The schools not only fail to hold the interest of the children themselves, but produce poorly educated citizens.

The criticisms overlap and, summarized so briefly,

sound very sweeping, yet even under recently improved conditions, there are many facts to bear them out.

Attendance

The United States Census of 1920 gives the population of persons five to twenty years of age, inclusive, as 33,250,870, and of persons five to fifteen years of age as 23,900,657. The school enrollment for the United States, however, is 21,473,316, and the average daily attendance at school only 16,150,035.

Of the 19,161,318 children seven to fifteen years old, 2,259,312 (11.8 per cent) are not attending school. The percentage of non-attendance for the seven- to thirteen-year-old group is 9.38, and for the fourteen- to fifteen-year-old group, 20.03.

And there are several factors which make these figures a probable understatement of real conditions. The census takers required no school record. The parents' word was accepted, and there are many parents who, failing to understand the purpose of the census, claim school attendance for their children simply to avoid the criticism which they fear will follow an admission of non-attendance. Then the inquiry covered only the period between September 1, 1919, and January 1, 1920, that is, the figures include all children who enrolled for the fall term, when most children do enroll, but who may have dropped out within a few months. And finally, attendance at any school, part-time, continuation or evening, was included, so that many children are classed as attendants who have left school in the usual sense of the term.

There is a wide variation among the states as to the

percentage of children attending school. The highest percentage of attendance for the seven- to thirteen-year-old group was in Massachusetts, 96.1 per cent, and the lowest in Alabama, 75.9 per cent. For the fourteen- to fifteen-year-old group, the highest percentage, 93.7, was in Utah, and the lowest, 59.0, in Rhode Island.

There is also wide variation between urban and rural schools, and in the rural schools between the consolidated and one-room types. The enrollment in rural schools is over three million more than in urban, but the average daily attendance in rural schools is only 1,800,000 more than in urban. In consolidated schools the attendance is usually 90 to 93 per cent of the enrollment, while in one-room schools it is often as low as 50 per cent.

To sum up the daily attendance situation: the average school term for the United States is 162 days, 184 days in urban schools, and 144 in rural, but according to attendance statistics, the average child is in school only 120 days. And as the average child, as will be shown, remains in school only a few years, the amount of schooling he receives is negligible. To quote the superintendent of schools of Evansville again, "The figures in Evansville are typical of the average city of its size throughout the United States. Practically four fifths of the children in the city are dropping out of school with just enough education to enable them to avoid being classed as illiterates."

School-leaving

Professor Paul Douglas, of the University of Chicago, summarizing various school-leaving investigations, said in 1921, "It is safe to conclude that there are approxi-

mately 1,100,000 children from thirteen to sixteen who have left school permanently, that the school mortality in these years is at least 50 per cent of those who began school before thirteen, that only 40 per cent of the children ever finish the grammar grades, that approximately only 8 per cent finish their high school education."

The National Child Labor Committee estimates that 1,000,000 children ten to fifteen years old leave school each year to go to work—and studies have shown that there are also large numbers of children out of school and idle. In Connecticut one child in four leaves school for work within a year after he may legally do so, according to the Children's Bureau. In Massachusetts, 30,000 children of fourteen to fifteen are out of school and at work. In New Jersey, 19,000 children of fourteen and fifteen receive work permits each year. In New York, in 1919-20, nearly 75,000 children of fourteen and fifteen received employment certificates.

The full significance of this cannot be realized unless something is known of the *amount of education* the children have received before leaving. Leonard P. Ayres, in *Laggards in Our Schools,* said:

"The great majority of pupils are eliminated from school at fourteen years of age prior to having reached the seventh grade. In states where literacy tests are prerequisite to employment certificates, it is often with great difficulty that the barest education requirements can be met. Many children have not been able to acquire the fundamental tools of education; many leave school before reaching the grades in which standards of citizenship are emphasized. The general tendency of American city school systems is to carry all the chil-

dren through the fifth grade, half of them to the final elementary grade, and one in ten to the final year of high school."

That comparatively few children go beyond the elementary grades is shown by the fact that high school enrollment for the United States is only 9.3 per cent of the total, the percentage varying from 19 in California to 2.2 in South Carolina.

Ten states have no educational requirement whatever for children who leave school at fourteen to go to work. Fourteen states require only the ability to read and write. Three states require completion of the fourth grade; eight states, the fifth grade; eight states, the sixth grade; and six states, the elementary school course, but with exceptions and exemptions allowed. Is it any wonder, considering the number of children who immediately avail themselves of the legal opportunity to leave school, that our illiteracy rate is so high that we are often called "a nation of sixth graders"? The Children's Bureau found, in administering the first federal child labor law, that in five states having no educational requirement for children going to work, more than half the children employed had not completed the fourth grade, more than one fourth could not even sign their own names legibly, and only 3 per cent had gone as far as the eighth grade. And the director of work for native-born illiterates in one of the Southern states points out that for children who leave school in the third or fourth grade there is such a thing as "reversion to illiteracy." She has found that many adults, now totally illiterate, have nevertheless had three or four years in school in the past. The National

Child Labor Committee points to this as a strong argument for basing compulsory attendance laws, not on age alone, but on educational achievement. "A child of fourteen who has not completed at least the sixth grade, preferably the eighth, is not qualified and belongs in school."

Reasons for School-leaving

It would be natural to suppose that this exodus of children from school as soon as it is legal indicates that the children *must* go to work for economic reasons, but studies of school-leaving cast serious doubt on the supposition. It is perfectly true that a large percentage of children go to work either because of poverty or because of a desire to raise the family subsistence level. Various studies in cities and states throughout the country show that anywhere from 26 to 40 per cent of the children go to work because of "economic pressure," which is, of course, a variable term. And even if children do leave school because of poverty, is it a legitimate reason for cutting off their education? A large proportion of our school attendance laws allow exemption on the ground of poverty. But as Edward A. Ross says, "A society earnestly bent on equalizing educational opportunities would see that no capable child would quit school because its parents could not support it, or needed its earnings." We have already in certain states mothers' pensions, but they are frequently inadequate. We have, also, "children's scholarships," but they are administered usually by private organizations and by no means cover the ground. Until "poverty exemptions" are taken out of

our school laws and we rid ourselves of the idea that a child must necessarily lose even an elementary school education because his parents are poor, that is until the states admit that they are rich enough to put our democratic ideals of "equality of opportunity" in practice, economic causes will continue to rank high as a cause of early school-leaving, and of low national educational standards.

But, as a matter of fact, if poverty were the main cause of school-leaving, the problem would be comparatively simple. As it happens, dissatisfaction with school on the part of the children appears to be a greater cause. Miss Anne Davis, summarizing a five-year study of school-leaving in Chicago, says, "There are two main reasons for children leaving school—economic pressure and dissatisfaction with school. *The latter plays the more important part.*" Mrs. Helen T. Woolley, discussing a similar study in Cincinnati, says, "The real reason which is sending the majority of these children out into the industrial field is their own desire to go to work, and behind this desire to go to work is frequently dissatisfaction with school." A federal inquiry into the reasons for school-leaving of children in two northern and three southern states several years ago showed that "48.9 per cent of the children were not satisfied at school, their attitude ranging from mere dislike to a positive hatred of everything connected with school." A study in Hartford, Conn., showed that "46 per cent of the children left school because they were restless and discontented, 20 per cent because they were backward, and 26 per cent because of economic pressure."

Why Are the Children Dissatisfied?

The old idea that a child has a natural dislike for the process of learning is rapidly disappearing. As John Dewey has suggested, to claim that the mind objects to the process of learning is like saying that the stomach objects to the process of digestion. The child's reaction to education depends on the *material* presented to it and the *method* of presentation.

There is, of course, the fact that children at fourteen or fifteen are in a naturally restless period, that they have a great desire then for productive activity, and that they rebel against the restrictions of school life. As Dr. Luther Gulick puts it:

"A change ought to and does come over children at that time (fourteen years) which demands a less materialistic environment than that of the elementary school. They are gripped by a new spirit of energy and independence which demands either the larger liberty of high school or the obligations of business. . . . It is a great biological fact with which we are dealing. When the wings of the nestling are grown, it leaves the nest. The same kind of force drives children out of the elementary school soon after they are fourteen. The elementary form of school is suited to *children* but not to *adolescents*. This is the first reason why children drop out of school at fourteen, no matter in what grade or part of the country they are."

But to agree to this diagnosis is not to say that children should leave school at fourteen; it is rather to say that the school must recognize the biological problem and give the children of fourteen and fifteen what

they need, preferably bringing them at that age to the grades where they will normally find what they need.

Retardation

There are people who say that retardation in school is *the* great cause of dissatisfaction and school-leaving. They say, further, that failure and retardation are the greatest faults of our school system: "The schools are training the children to the habit of failure," so that when they go out into the world they have never learned the habit and joy of successful effort, but regard failure as normal and are unsuccessful or zestless workers.

It is certainly true, as investigation has shown, that the majority of early school-leavers are those who were behind their school grades. But the thing may well work in a circle, lack of interest or dissatisfaction creating failure and retardation, that is, retardation may be merely one evidence of some fundamental error in our educational method.

Retardation is very general. Statistics have been collected in various quarters to show that anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent of our school children are behind their supposedly normal grades or do not progress at what is considered the normal rate. It is usually stated that retardation is even more general in rural than in urban schools, due probably to the greater irregularity of attendance there, to the shorter school term, and to the poorer quality of school equipment and instruction. But even in city schools it is a serious matter, as Superintendent Ettinger's recent report in New York City shows. There it was found that 20 per cent of all the pupils were retarded one term; 10.8 per cent, two terms; 6.5 per

cent, three terms; 3.7 per cent, four terms; 2.2 per cent, five terms; and 2.3 per cent, six terms or more—a total of 45.9 per cent of all the enrolled pupils retarded. "As we go upward through the grades," says Superintendent Ettinger, "we find the number of retarded pupils and also the number of accelerated pupils grow at the expense of the normal pupils. There is a marked decrease in the number of retarded pupils after the Six B grade, *due to the elimination of retarded pupils which the law makes possible.*"

Poverty or poor home conditions, irregular attendance, physical disabilities and mental defects are the more obvious causes of retardation, and for the most part they may be considered as causes outside the school, but which the school can and must do a great deal to remedy. In the matter of irregular attendance, for instance, not only is the school responsible for the enforcement of attendance laws, but much of the *cause of absence* is found within the school. In a study of causes of absence, in nine states in different sections of the country, by the National Child Labor Committee it was found that "sickness," "work" and "indifference" were the three chief assigned causes. Numerically the three ranked about equal, but actually "indifference" was found to be the most important, because it frequently underlay the two other excuses. A child would give "sickness" as an excuse for absence when it was not actual sickness that kept the child out, but the attitude of the parents and the child which did not give school attendance much importance in the scheme of things. In the same way, "work" was given as an excuse when the child either stayed out of school and did some work as a result of

staying out, or preferred "work" to school, and so stayed out.

In the matter of mental disabilities, also, which might be regarded as something the school could not remedy, it has been found that "mental defects" is a relative term, that many mental defects are temporary and disappear when the child is given proper care and treatment, and that often they are caused by maladjustment between the child and his work. That there is a permanent mental retardation which is hereditary is unquestionably true, but it must not be confused with the kind of mental deficiency that comes from lack of care, remediable physical defects, or lack of contact between the child's school work and his abilities and interests. A psychological study of children in two New York school districts who were retarded for more than two years, or four school terms, that is of excessive retardation, showed that 53.6 per cent of the pupils were mentally under-age, 20.6 per cent normal, and 25.8 per cent mentally over-age. But if almost half of the greatly retarded pupils are mentally normal or over-age, how can we say that actual mental deficiencies are the chief cause of retardation?

The fact that exceptionally bright as well as dull children are retarded has been shown by Professor Lewis Terman, of Leland Stanford, who says, "Psychological tests show that children of superior ability are likely to be misunderstood in school. The writer has tested more than a hundred children who were as much above average intelligence as moron defectives are below. The large majority of these were found located below the school grade warranted by their intellectual level. One third had failed to reap any advantage whatever, in terms

of promotion, from their superior intelligence. Even genius languishes when kept over-long at tasks that are too easy." In a study of 1,000 school children, Professor Terman found that "practically every child whose grade failed to correspond fairly closely with his mental age was either exceptionally bright or exceptionally dull. . . . The very dull children were usually located one to three grades above where they belonged by mental age, and the duller the child, the more serious, as a rule, was the misplacement. On the other hand, the very bright children were nearly always located from one to three grades below where they belonged by mental age, and the brighter the child, the more serious the school's mistake. All this is due to one fact, and one alone: *the school tends to promote children by age rather than by ability.* The retardation problem is exactly the reverse of what we have thought it to be. It is the bright children who are retarded, and the dull children who are accelerated."

The Fault of the "System"

The fact is that most educators who have studied retardation and early school-leaving with a desire to get to fundamental causes agree that *lack of adjustment between the child and the school, or failure of the school to provide what the child needs,* is the chief cause of dissatisfaction, lack of interest, retardation and school-leaving. The "system" is to blame, rather than the child.

The whole situation is best summed up by Professor Junius Merriam, of the University of Missouri, when he says: "Retardation, as an assigned cause, is probably

largely due to the failure of school officials to provide that kind of schoolroom occupation which is suited to certain types of boys and girls. Those pupils designated as retarded do rank low when tested by the particular types of intellectual work called for in the traditional school. Some mental tests of another nature might compel us to question if the retarded pupils might not be the accelerated ones in a curriculum made to fit their needs. Lack of differentiation is due to a curriculum so stereotyped that little opportunity is left for individual variation. Indifference is readily explained on the basis of the curriculum not being constructed according to tastes and abilities of pupils. Desire for activity is readily understood when one notes the extent to which the traditional curriculum is one of passively learning rather than of actively doing."

The "Modern" View

To sum up, from our modern point of view, quite aside from such obvious, and after all only secondary, faults as poor equipment, weak administration or poor instruction, the fundamental troubles with our school system are:

(1) Too great uniformity and inflexibility; failure to make provision for individual differences; failure to utilize and develop individual abilities.

(2) A stereotyped, traditional course of study that neither awakes interest nor meets the needs of modern life.

The whole trend of modern educational theory is to emphasize the child's characteristics and abilities, to adapt the school to his present needs, rather than to try to fit him to a hard-and-fast, traditional curriculum based on

certain things that we believe he will need to know later as an adult. We say nowadays that education means, not filling a child's mind with supposedly necessary external material, but developing the child in every way, physically, mentally, morally and socially, for fuller *present* life, because we believe that out of present development will come enrichment of life in the future.

Our modern view is psychologically sound, it is in keeping with child nature as we know it. The child lives in the present. He is absorbed in life as he lives it every day, and he is essentially active; he is not interested in the accumulation of knowledge as such, but in the things he *does,* and out of his present experiences come his future abilities and appreciations. That is one reason why we talk of "relating school to life" and of "learning by doing," as well as of considering the individual child, and not a hypothetical adult, as our problem.

There is nothing really new in this "modern" view. It goes back to Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and even to the Greeks. But we have to thank such men as Dewey, Kirkpatrick and others for showing us the implications of the theories in terms of modern life and knowledge.

John Dewey states the case in the terms of Rousseau's idea, as follows:—

"The child is best prepared for life as an adult by experiencing in childhood what has meaning to him as a child; and further, the child has a right to enjoy his childhood. Because he is a growing animal, who must develop so as to live successfully in the grown-up world, nothing should be done to interfere with growth, and everything should be done to futher the full and free development of his body and his mind." The strength of

the theory, or its chief beauty for us, is that we believe it is leading us to a greater enrichment of life, that through it we will achieve an education that is neither formal nor external, but which will produce higher social development, better understanding of life.

But our immediate concern is the adaptation of our existing "system" to our modern ideas, the testing out of our theories, experimentation and change. There is nothing static about our present educational situation, in fact the one thing of which we seem to be sure is that education cannot be static, that it must change as life changes. There is nothing fixed even in "modern" or "progressive" educational theory. The school administrators themselves are in a period of "learning by doing" and for that reason our whole school situation is of absorbing interest. It is alive and moving; it inspires more and more people to effort and interest; and for those who are awake to its implications, every change and every experiment is full of significance.

Some Modern Experiments

The danger in this situation is, of course, that we will seize on everything labelled as "new" and believe it to be necessarily good. But the opposite attitude of believing that nothing new can possibly "work" is just as bad. Trying and testing must go on, but it must be done in the scientific attitude which refuses to jump at conclusions, which demands training and expertness as well as enthusiasm on the part of the experimenters, and which, having concluded that changes are necessary and that knowledge must be back of useful change, is willing to make haste slowly in the interests of accuracy. For the

"ordinary citizen" this means chiefly that he must know enough about the weakness of our schools to appreciate the efforts toward improvement, that he must be intelligent enough on educational subjects to refuse either to be stampeded or to be a standpatter, and to recognize intelligent effort where he sees it. For the school-men themselves, it means open-mindedness and a certain humility in the face of the problem, together with a recognition of our fundamental aims and a determination to achieve the "scientific attitude" at all costs.

It would be impossible to discuss in detail here all the "modern" experiments that are going on in our schools. Some of them are especially important, however, chiefly because of the problems they in themselves present, or because of the theories and situations back of them.

There is, for instance, the growing tendency to apply *mental* tests for the re-grouping and classification of children or for the purposes of educational guidance to individual children. In schools where the tests are used, together usually with physical and other examinations, there are classes for children of superior intelligence, classes for the bright, the dull, the average, the subnormal, for neurotic children, for anemic and undernourished children and for children with other special physical disabilities. Closely allied with this re-grouping is the flexible grading system which allows each child to progress through school at his normal rate. It has worked successfully in many schools, but the question is how to adapt it to other schools. How, for instance, is the rural school teacher with her present equipment and training even to approximate "re-grouping" or flexible grading? The answer may be, to change the entire rural school

system. But how are we to change it? And to return to the "re-grouping" problem, are we safe in leaning so heavily on mental tests? There is a danger of forgetting their limitations, of believing that they will operate like a foot rule or a pair of scales, when actually we know that intelligence cannot, as yet, be rated absolutely, that our scale is merely tentative and that all sorts of other considerations must enter into the classification of every single child. Mental tests can be used only with the greatest tact and discretion, and the use and study of them calls, above all, for the scientific spirit, for a refusal to jump at conclusions, even though the uses to which they have been put may have been worth while.

Then there are the *curriculum changes,* the attempts to "relate the school to life," to educate the child in living, not in a prescribed list of subjects. Most of the experiments here have been, for obvious reasons, in private schools, and the adaptation of them to public schools and large classes is a serious problem. Some of the "new" courses of study are based on the supposed psychological growth of the child, the "stages" through which he goes. Others attempt merely to correlate subjects in the traditional curriculum to each other and to every-day life. Still others reject, as in the first case, the traditional course of study, but instead of following the "stages of growth," center the curriculum for each grade around certain phases of the child's environment and every-day life, using observation, play, stories (reading, telling, dramatizing, and studying) and handwork all as interrelated.

Other attempts to vitalize the schools are in *methods* of teaching. The underlying principle of them is that the

child's interest must be secured, that he learns best what and when he wants to learn, and that he learns best by active participation, rather than by passive absorption. The methods run all the way from the use of plays and games to awake interest to the "project method" which sets forth a definite task or problem, in the choice of which the children have a part, and which they work out themselves under guidance and supervision. In none of these methods does the fact that children are given more freedom of action and choice than under the older methods mean that guidance is lacking or that teaching is easier. Actually the project method, for instance, calls for a much more subtle and thorough kind of supervision, and the teacher must be very thoroughly trained in method. Consequently, it is difficult to adapt the idea to schools where teachers have not had special training or where classes are too crowded to admit individual guidance, but that does not mean that the method itself is not good. As Stanwood Cobb said recently in the *Atlantic Monthly* of this "progressive movement" in education: "Every movement has three stages. First people say, 'There is nothing to it.' Then they say, 'It cannot succeed.' Finally, its successful establishment leads people to remark, 'I always believed in it.' The progressive movement has already passed the first stage, and has reached the point where the criticism against it is, 'It could never succeed in the public school.' The reason given is that it would be unfeasible in classes of forty and fifty. Progressive educators admit the difficulty; but does the fault lie with progressive education, or with a system which puts fifty children in one classroom under a tired teacher?"

Play as a part of school work is growing in importance. This is, not only because it affords a way of furthering physical development, but because it furthers the child's whole development as well and is a further means of enriching life. One of our greatest social problems in this industrial and mechanical age, and one which the schools are more and more realizing, is the proper developmental and social use of leisure. When leisure is precious and rare, and when over against it we have set a peculiarly deadening industrial life, it is no wonder that the schools talk of *educating for the right use of leisure.*

I thought for a long time that I was the first to preach the gospel of the importance of the right use of leisure, but I discovered later that Aristotle, over 2,000 years ago, had insisted that to teach the right use of leisure was the chief object of education. In his day, however, only a small fraction of the population had all the leisure. The remaining three fourths had none whatever. Now all have more or less leisure and with the continuing development of machinery are likely to have still more. In view of this, and in view of the fact that for millions the automatic nature of their work requires little training, the main end of education does become for the many what Aristotle proclaimed it to be for the few. This has been especially well presented in Arthur Pound's *The Iron Man in Industry.*

One curriculum change which is evidently a result of the desire to relate the school to life is the growth of *vocational education,* and there is no doubt that in a country so predominantly industrial as ours, where the greater proportion of our children go into industry, and hitherto have gone, be it said, practically untrained and

therefore unfit for any but the most unskilled operations, vocational training is necessary. The school that provides none of it is dooming its children to unskilled, deadening jobs, and letting them go into the world without the least idea either of their own tastes and abilities or of the nature and variety of occupations ahead of them. But, on the other hand, the school that overdoes industrial training is rejecting all the rest of life. The problem is one of balance. The nature of the community the school serves and the nature of each child himself must be considered in solving it. But some kind of vocational training, and especially vocational guidance as the children leave school, is a duty of every school, city or country, rich or poor, for from every school children go into some kind of wage-earning occupation.

Another modern phase of the relation of the school to industry is the *continuation school*. If we are frank, we admit it is a makeshift. Because for one reason or another we do not keep children in school long enough to give them much education, we have invented this method of continuing their education after they become wage-earners. It has its obvious disadvantages. Some employers dislike it because it means expense and trouble for them in giving children time out of their working hours for school. Some educators dislike it because they believe it is too expensive for the school and does not produce enough results. On the other hand, it is clearly better for the children than night school, for instance, because it does not add schooling to hours of labor. Also, it is clearly better than no further education or than the small amount of elementary schooling the working-children receive. The strongest argument in its favor is

actually that there is no chance for education or growth *in industry itself;* children take unskilled mechanical tasks and stay in them or shift aimlessly from one to another. At present, unless the continuation school comes to their rescue, the fourteen- and fifteen-year-olds who go to work have little chance for development and every chance, under the deadening influence of mechanical tasks, for retrogression. So long as we have a democratic ideal of education, and unless we are willing to raise our school and child labor age limits and keep the children in school longer, the continuation school is a necessity. The talk of expense in this connection is to forget the future and the eternal waste of the untrained and uneducated in industry and in society.

Rural Schools

The relative inefficiency of the rural school, as compared with the urban, is well known. The annual per capita expenditure for each pupil enrolled in city schools is $40.60; in rural schools, $24.13. These figures are for current expenses only and do not include amounts spent for new buildings, grounds and equipment. But the average amount spent for improvements in city schools, per child enrolled, is $7.16 and for rural schools, $4.82. The same disadvantage operates for the rural child in the matter of teachers. For every dollar the city child has invested in his teacher, the rural child has fifty-five cents. In 1919 the United States Bureau of Education reported that 40 per cent of the rural school teachers receive less than $600 a year, 24 per cent less than $500, 11 per cent less than $400, and only 5 per cent, $1000 or more. Considering these figures and the conditions under which

rural teachers live and work, it is not surprising that three tenths of them, or about 90,000, leave the field annually and that at least two thirds remain not more than one year in the same school. Fifty per cent of the rural school teachers in the United States have not completed a four-year high school course; 10 per cent have finished only the seventh or eighth grade; and one third have had no professional training whatever. "The typical country school teacher," says the National Education Association, "is an eighteen-year-old girl who stays one year in a place and whose only supervision is one or two visits annually from a county superintendent with little or no professional training himself." Of the 30,000 Negro teachers in rural schools, one half have had no education beyond the sixth grade. The average annual salary for Negro teachers in rural schools is $129.

With the average urban school term at 184 days and the average rural term, 144, the rural school child has 320 less days of schooling in an elementary course than a city child, or about two school years for the country at large. But he really loses more than that, because the average daily attendance in rural schools is only 65 per cent of the enrollment, while in city schools it is 80 per cent. The per cent of all city children completing high school is 29; of rural children, 5. Moreover, rural schools are often poor in equipment, both for work and for recreation; the school buildings of the one-room type are often poorly furnished and even unsanitary, with bad lighting and ventilation; and owing to the nature of the school organization and equipment, only the most meagre elementary instruction can be given.

Studies in various states have shown that rural school

children do not progress so far, even in elementary school, as city children, that retardation among them is greater, and that, grade for grade, rural school children have less education than city children.

To realize the full meaning of this rural school situation, we must understand its magnitude. The total population living on farms in the United States is 38,000,000. The population living in villages (less than 2,500 inhabitants) is 11,000,000. The number of children enrolled in one- and two-teacher rural and village schools alone is 8,000,000, or more than one third of the total school enrollment. There are 200,000 one- and two-room rural school buildings, and the total number of rural teachers, 300,000 is just half the teaching population of the nation. The Negro child in rural schools is even worse off than the white child, and there are 2,000,000 Negro children of school age in the rural districts. Eighty-five per cent of the 12,000,000 Negroes in this country live on the land.

Fortunately, the rural school situation is attracting more and more attention, and most hopeful sign of all is the fact that in many sections of the country the rural population itself is aroused. Several surveys of rural schools have resulted in loud protests from the farm population itself that these studies are made by people who do not understand local conditions, and therefore suggest remedies that will not fit the case. Insofar as this indicates, not merely a refusal to accept criticism, but a desire to act on the problem, it is a healthy sign. Every state is responsible for its rural children just as much as its city children and cannot afford to discriminate in favor of either. But the real solution of the rural school

problem can come only from within; when the farm population is awake and articulate on the subject of its schools, rural education will be alive and progressive.

Dorothy Canfield Fisher has described very charmingly the efforts of an old lady in a Vermont rural community to "adopt" her district school. She suddenly woke up to the fact that the teacher had no decent living-quarters and took her into her own little house. From that time on, little by little, she was doing things for the district school which ran all the way from providing a wash-basin and soap for the children, to demanding better school books and staging a telephone campaign to force the attendance officer to mind his job. But the old lady's own view was, "Do you know, I re'lize now I've never known any more about the daily life of that school than if 'twas on the moon! . . . You know what the Scripture says about doing what your hand finds to do. Well, just knowing what goes on at school has give *my* hand good and plenty to do!"

Community and Parental Responsibility to Schools

That old lady's experience might well serve as an example for citizens, not only in the country, but everywhere. So long as *our* children, the inhabitants of *our* communities, are being educated in the schools, it is, not only our business, but our duty to know "what goes on at school" and to act on our knowledge. The state has the ultimate responsibility for schools, but the community and the parent have the most vital responsibility. The surest

way of vitalizing American education is to make the American school a living issue in every community.

It is a trite saying that the country is the backbone of the United States. Its springs and brooks feed the great rivers as they move cityward. Its youth turns eyes towards the places where factories, terminals and commerce cluster on the bank where the river meets the lake or the sea, or some larger river. Its food travels the highways of concrete, of iron and of water. The nation is beginning to see that the springs of water, of youth, of food, must be conserved. Replanting of depleted woods, equalizing school opportunities and readjusting finances are some of the answers to a significant national problem. A rural community to be prosperous needs good soil to build upon, brains to work it, money to finance it, cooperation to sell its products, railways and roads to carry its offerings and public recognition of fair outgoing values to return to the community the wherewith-all for the incoming values.

These incoming values are health, education and opportunity for spiritual growth. "No child shall be disadvantaged by the community in which he happens to be born" is a national ideal. "No adult should be expected to live under conditions which do not provide for self-expression, which makes for a higher and finer life" may well express the unspoken feelings of the rural people. "No community of homes should be disadvantaged by its location in its opportunities for the creation of material wealth and of human happiness" is an ever-present thought in all our nationalism. Help from without is well, but it means a help that will help from within.

Taxation

The citizen who objects to school improvements because they raise taxes has a very narrow view. "Taxes," Professor Shenton says, in *Christian Aspects of Economic Reconstruction,* "are a contribution which an individual or a corporation makes for the public good." Taxes that we pay for the support of schools are our contribution to national betterment, and wherever we weaken the schools or hinder their growth by inadequate support, we are lowering our national standard. "Let but one generation of American boys and girls be rightly trained in body, mind and spirit, in knowledge and love and unselfishness, and all the knotty problems of our American life, social, economic and political, would be far on the road toward complete solution. Let the training of but one generation be wholly neglected, and our civilization, losing its art, science, literature and religion, would be far on the road to primeval savagery. The right training of the young is the spiritual reproduction of the race, the flower of a nation's civilization, the supreme test and most accurate measure of its wisdom and culture." This is the view of Dr. Henry L. Smith of Washington-Lee University, and if it is an expression of our national conception of the place of education, it is clear that our schools are the first thing we must support and the last thing we must economize on. Every thinking citizen knows that, considering the waste in much of our civil and state government, the size of our national budget for purposes that cannot be considered constructive and the magnitude of our national bill for luxuries, we are far from the point in national economy where we cannot afford increased

support for education. There are only two things to consider in school taxation; first, whether we are wasting money in other lines that might be used more profitably for schools; and second, whether our school funds are properly administered and sufficient.

I once had a part in writing a book on *Taxation in States and Cities*. I have said to my old master, with whom I was associated in its authorship, that I have hoped that we might some day bring out another edition, and that if we did, I should like to add a chapter on, "How to make people happy in paying their taxes." It would show how the taxes transmuted have opened the eyes of the blind, unstopped the ears of the deaf and brought light to darkened minds. Sometimes the achievement of one individual alone makes return for all that a community spends for schools in a generation, not to speak of what it does for thousands of others.

Private Schools

Especially in the East there is a growing tendency for the "better," that is, richer, classes to send their children to private schools. Private schools have made many contributions to progress in education; most of our educational experiments have originated and been tested in private schools. And there may be many reasons why, for a given child, a special school is necessary. Dallas Lore Sharpe and many others have warned us, however, of the dangers of private schools in a democracy, and theoretically, at least, they do not belong in our system of education. Yet the danger of them lies, not so much in the fact that a certain number of children are being educated outside the public school, as in the tendency of

the parent to lose interest in the public school because his own child is not an attendant, and the fact that such a parent comes from the more enlightened section of the population makes his defection the more serious. It is very short-sighted to believe that because a child is not in public school, his parent has no special concern with the school or with the children who are educated there, for, after all, those children are the ones with whom the favored child is to live and work later, and their social and moral development is to affect the tone of the world in which the favored child must live. The far-seeing, social-minded parent knows very well that "the best that he wants for his own child must be his ideal for all children," and that insofar as he shifts his responsibilities toward public education, he lowers national efficiency for his own child's generation.

The Church and the School

The Church has been the mother of the school in America. We can never overestimate the value of the heroic, patient, God-fearing service of those pioneers of the Church who laid the foundations of the schools, especially the higher schools and colleges, all the way across this continent. Many of us of my generation have reason to be personally grateful for the establishment of such institutions as Oberlin, Knox, Beloit, Grinnell, Whitman. They make a chain of gold "around the feet of God," these prayers of the pioneers, transmuted into blessings for their children and children's children.

The State has taken over a good share of their pioneer task. But in newer communities that work must still be carried on by the missionary institutions, which are but

the pioneers of today; as, for example, in the southern mountains where, owing to the poverty of the country and the isolation of the people, the system of public instruction through popular schools has practically broken down. The typical school in the southern mountain district is maintained for only two or three months of the year. The teacher in most instances has had no Normal training and has scarcely been beyond the fifth or sixth grade herself. The children are taken out of school to work in the fields and help support the family. The Church has established schools for Normal and industrial training with the purpose of raising up leaders and teachers for the local communities. The increasing school year and rising standard of school excellence is largely due to these missionary contributions of the Church.

There are 11,000,000 Negroes, mostly resident in the southern states, whose education has been sadly neglected. In 1880, of the Negroes over ten years of age, 70 per cent were illiterate. In thirty years this percentage had fallen to 30.4 per cent. There is still a relatively high degree of illiteracy among Negroes, but conditions are rapidly improving. The schools, academies and colleges planned by the mission boards of the churches are very largely responsible for this improvement. Not only have they given an education to children who otherwise would not have had it, but they have been furnishing leadership in the form of an educated ministry and a qualified corps of teachers, two fields of leadership in which the southern Negro has been heretofore badly handicapped.

Turning to the Mexicans, of whom there are 1,750,000, we find conditions somewhat similar to those among the Negroes. The study of 1,081 Mexican families in the

Plaza section of Los Angeles revealed that 55 per cent of the men and 74 per cent of the women could not speak English, 67 per cent of the men and 84 per cent of the women could not read English, and 75 per cent of the men and 85 per cent of the women could not write English. The Plaza school is an elementary school under mission board auspices, and it has gone a long way toward giving the children of these Mexicans a better opportunity than their parents ever had, while higher schools of education are providing intelligent, Christian, native leadership.

Without multiplying instances, it is enough to say that the same sort of thing has been done in Alaska, in Cuba and Porto Rico and among the Indians scattered all over the country. The several groups referred to above can never fully discharge the debt they owe to the missionary vision and missionary gifts of the Church for these educational opportunities, as we cannot pay our debt to those who one, two, three or more generations ago gave like service in what are now prosperous communities.

Broadly speaking, no other institution can have so much interest in the school as the Christian Church. Charles W. Ellwood analyzes the relationship in *The Reconstruction of Religion:*

"Every Christian church should manifestly be a teaching church. From one point of view, this is its supreme work. Only, we need to remember that teaching is not an end in itself. The end which is sought by teaching, after all, is a practical end—the transformation of human conduct and human institutions. Education is a means and a method, not an end in itself. The Church must be truly an educational institution, and until it recognizes it-

self and is recognized as a fundamental educational institution, the Church will not function rightly, nor will human society be right. The relation between the Church and the school is therefore a very close one, and should be much closer than that which exists in American society at the present day. We need not go to the extreme of making the Church absorb the school or the school absorb the Church, as that is opposed to the principle of division of labor in social evolution, which holds for institutions as well as for individuals. But there can be and should be the closest cooperation between the school and the Church."

In this cooperation the Church has much to give and much to gain. If the Church stands beside every progressive element in the schools of its community, there is just so much more impetus toward progress. If the Church stands with the school in providing recreational opportunities within its community, there is just so much more chance for wholesome and developmental uses of leisure time in the community. Church and school working together can weld the best elements of their communities, producing that unity of action and purpose that means achievement.

And the Church has much to learn from the school for its own purposes. Education in church schools is often sadly behind the times, and consequently the Church is ineffective at exactly the point where it must be most effective—the training of young people. If the Church will keep in touch with modern methods and ideals in secular education, it will find a great deal to regenerate its own educational method. Many church schools are already doing this, but there is yet a long way to go, and for its

own good the Church cannot neglect the study and use of modern educational theories and practices.

Schools, after all, are but the reflection of the life of our people. The colonial school was a simple affair because the industrial and social life of the period was simple. A village "common" was the recreational spot for summer evenings and occasions of state. The general store furnished local gossip and forum discussions. The shoemaker's shop, the blacksmith's forge, the wheelwright's stone, the miller's wheel, offered vocational guidance and direction. The church had its "social" and baked beans and hot brown bread supper. The home had its spinning wheel, churn, garden, dairy and "jack-of-all-trades" master and "woman-of-all-work" mistress. The school merely supplemented other agencies of the community—all of which were educative and operated under an open-door policy.

Life is now very complicated. Nothing is as it was formerly. Science, industry, economics and education have taken on new meanings and new expressions. Morons, psychoanalysis, psychology, automatic, card index, tests, medians, and so on are new ideas in a vocabulary of new words. Is it strange that children and schools should take on a new meaning? The new interpretation of the child and his education are not less significant than the changes in production and distribution; in combating disease and crime; in transportation of goods, of speech, of light, of heat and of ideas.

Not only is modern life complex, but the suggestions for solving its problems are complex and often confusing. The same is true of its schools. But after all, the problems of education are no more, or no less, than the prob-

lems of industry, of government, of Church, of home or of life itself.

Production has made possible the interchangeable part. Education is attempting to nationalize itself so that no child may be disadvantaged because of the community in which he is born. Industry is saving its by-products and making them often of more worth than the product itself. Schools are trying to preserve the native genius in the production of a mass product. Industry is trying to find a place for the vocational expression of each individual, according to his ability, capacity and desire. Education is attempting to test capacities and interests that each child may find his heart's and mind's desire. Commerce is salvaging its waste products. Schools are preventing discards from being thrown on the scrap-heap. Commerce offers a variety of goods at varying prices. Schools are meeting various needs of a varied people.

Science has brought the symphony to the distant fireside by unseen messengers from central stations. The school has extended its service to adults and those younger ones out of school by extension and correspondence courses. Economics advocates the minimum wage. Education demands at least the minimum essentials. Business calls for cost-accounting, statistics, taxes and median lines. School authorities are working on school taxes, efficiency curves and community accountability. The state has its regulatory laws which make the individual subservient to the mass good. The school has its requirements which make communities and parents think of the child.

Yes, life is complex, and all that enters into it. The cry is for system—in business and in government. This cry is reflected in education. The problem of schools,

like the problem of industry, is to get the product and to distribute it. One concerns itself with the production of material wealth; the other with human wealth; but the latter does not yield to mechanical treatment. It is a thing largely of the spirit, intangible, imponderable, indefinable and so, infinite. When the first subway was built in New York, I joined with others in praising the great engineer who planned it, but I said that, after all, his task was not comparable in difficulty with that of the teacher, for when he had found the formula for one horizontal yard of his subway, he had solved the problem of the whole tunnel, whereas when a teacher has found the solution of one perpendicular yard of child humanity, she cannot be sure that she can solve the next yard in the same way. There are no typical children. Each is a living soul with incalculable possibilities.

The Church has a continuing responsibility for every school child; for the school in our heterogeneous communities cannot alone minister to all the needs of the child. The Church must stand, if not as the little church I knew best did, across the road from the school, at any rate, near enough to supplement with its eternal ministries the teaching of that which is temporal.

VII

Children in Need of Special Care

Toward those children whom we classify as in need of special care—poor children, neglected, orphaned, illegitimate, physically handicapped, mentally defective, and delinquent—private charity, the public conscience and the State have long recognized a responsibility. They are the children of whom we think first when we speak of child welfare work, and for their care we have long-established societies, institutions and laws. But the public attitude toward them and the technique of their care has undergone a steady change. The days when efforts in their behalf were purely humane and protective are gone; we talk now of prevention, education and development for a normal life. Gone, too, is the day when these "unfortunate" children were regarded as liabilities whom private agencies and the State must make immediately "useful." For we know that a child is a social liability only when he does not receive opportunity for full development, and that usefulness in the long run and apparent present usefulness are two different things, since the surest way of building for the future for any child is to pay strict attention to his particular child needs. To penalize a child for his economic, physical or mental handicaps by giving him anything less than the normal rights of childhood, we believe is the negation of real child welfare. "The treatment that you would want for your own child, for every child," is the slogan of modern child welfare work, and while the states, the public and even social workers have

by no means achieved any such thing, the trend is definitely in that direction, the child welfare creed is based on that idea, and hinges entirely on the normal needs of every child.

A Program To Be Achieved

Such a creed might be summarized as follows:—(Most of these statements are taken directly from the Minimum Standards for the Protection of Children in Need of Special Care, adopted by the Children's Bureau Conference in 1919, or from the platform of the White House Conference on Dependent Children in 1909.)

Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization, and *every child* should have a normal home life, an opportunity for education, recreation, vocational preparation for life, and for moral and spiritual development in harmony with American ideals and the educational and spiritual agencies by which these rights of the child are normally safeguarded.

The ultimate responsibility for children who, on account of improper home conditions, physical or mental handicap, or delinquency, are in need of special care, devolves upon the State, and the aim of their care must be to secure for each child, as nearly as possible, normal home life and normal development.

When a child must, for special reasons, be removed from his own family home, the nearest approach to a normal home life must be secured for him. Consequently, foster homes for such children should be secured wherever possible, and where institutional care is necessary, the institution should be organized on the "cottage plan," or in such way as to provide for personal relations between the adult workers and each child.

But no child should be removed from his own home except under the most unusual circumstances. Poverty alone is not sufficient excuse for such removal, though inefficiency or immorality may be. And for the conservation of home life, the State or private agencies interested in the care of children must

supplement family incomes wherever necessary, reconstruct family conditions so as to make the home safe for the child, or so supervise the child as to make his continued presence safe for the community. Where a temporary removal of the child is necessary, this ultimate rehabilitation of the family or training of the child for return to his family must be kept in view.

To achieve the normal development desired for each child, there must be careful study, not only of his family environment and his physical needs, but of his mental and emotional make-up, —a complete understanding of each child, in order to assure him the treatment necessary for his individual case. But in all cases this treatment should be, as nearly as possible, like the life of other children in the community.

To assure every child in need of special care the best treatment, in accordance with these principles, the State, through a board of charities or similar supervisory body, must be responsible for regular inspection and licensing of every institution, agency or association, public or private, that receives or cares for children. This supervision should be conceived and exercised in harmony with democratic ideals which invite and encourage the service of efficient, altruistic forces of society in the common welfare. The incorporation of such institutions, agencies and associations should be required and should be subject to the approval of the State board.

The State child welfare laws should be carefully considered at regular intervals to allow for revision, coordination and the inclusion of new provisions in harmony with the best experience of the day. For such study and revision of legislation, a child welfare committee or commission should be created by the State, and there should be national conferences, as well, to consider the whole question of child welfare legislation.

Such a creed is a long way from the days when orphan children were bound out as apprentices, and the feeble-minded or physically defective were thrust into institutions, from humane motives, but with little care for anything but expediency. Yet such a creed is also a long

way from the actual practice in regard to these children in many parts of the country. People still believe that a poor child must be deprived of normal child rights and put to work because of poverty. People still believe that handicapped, neglected or defective children can best be handled in large groups without real individual care, and that taking them off the community's hands is the main function of an institution. People are still impatient with the apparently interminable investigations of families and "cases" by social workers, and the so-called practical soul is still heard saying, "If that child is poor, by all means give him relief—but why all this fuss about the way his family lives, their pedigree, their health and such nonsense? If they can't take care of him, take him away. If he is a bad boy, put him in a reform school. But don't waste time and money investigating!"

Extreme cases of a real negation of child welfare are still found in the common practice of child care in the United States. Within the last five years children have been found "bound out" for a term of years; child "criminals" have been sent to chain gangs and cells with adult felons; institutions have been found that were far below modern standards in even such obvious matters as the feeding, clothing and physical care of children, and where children were punished for speaking during meals, or similar heinous crimes. Mental defectives are still struggling in ordinary school classes and are frequently unrecognized when they come before a court for delinquency. Rural children are often without even the rudiments of organized child care and protection. Illegitimate children are taken away from their mothers without court procedure and placed-out without due investigation. There

is still lack of treatment, curative and preventive, of even the most obvious physical defects, especially in rural districts. And all these things go back to the lack of machinery for the discovery of the children in need of special care, lack of supervision and standardization of their care, lack of the sense of community and state responsibility for them, and the curious combination of sentiment, carelessness and expediency that remains in a certain portion of the public mind with regard to them. The immediate reasons for the abuse or lack of proper care for handicapped children are ignorance and lack of thought on the part of some of the people into whose hands the children fall, but the ultimate reason is the failure of communities and states to realize the possibilities of constructive care for all children.

What Has Been Done

The White House Conference in 1909, when delegates from all sorts of public and private agencies and institutions, from every state and from every religious division, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, agreed on a definite platform of child care, marked a tremendous advance in the unity of our national child welfare work. The creation of the federal Children's Bureau, in 1912, was another step in advance, and its Children's Year activities during the War spread the gospel of child care through the nation, awakening many communities to activity that private agencies had not reached, while the Conference of 1919 actually brought together our present national "Minimum Standards of Child Welfare." The codification of state child welfare laws and the creation of state departments of child or public welfare, which have spread rapidly in the

last few years, are further evidences of this attempt to standardize and to bring adequate care to every child in need of it. Such developments as that in North Carolina, where county agents have been appointed by the state department to bring supervision and care to rural as well as city children, and where the State University offers a training school for local child welfare workers, are healthy signs as to what is going on in what we have rather foolishly classified as our "backward states." In fact, there are so-called progressive states that might well take lessons from North Carolina—or Alabama, another state which has made great progress within a few years—in the vigor and eagerness with which they are attacking their child problems and in the local initiative and leadership that is implicit in the attack. Both these states began by calling in a national child welfare agency to make a survey and offer expert advice. But local cooperation was with the surveys, and the advice was acted on intelligently and with a real sense of the children's needs and rights. The lesson which all states and communities must learn from these surveys and children's codes is that there can be nothing haphazard about adequate care of either normal or handicapped children, that the study and care of them is scientific insofar as our present knowledge and experience allows, and that the state and community must always be looking ahead for better care and more knowledge—in the interests of self-betterment, if for no other reason.

Number of Children in Need of Special Care

It is next to impossible to estimate the number of children who come under this classification, because there is

no adequate census of them, and their care is still scattered among various agencies in many sections. Parmelee, in *Poverty and Social Progress,* estimated that on the basis of the 1910 Census, there were at least 200,000 dependent children receiving institutional or society care in this country. Dr. Arnold Gesell, of Yale University, estimates that "one public school out of twenty-five may be regarded as exceptional from the point of view of child welfare and school administration," and says that the distribution of these children per thousand of all children of compulsory school age would be approximately:

Blind and partially sighted	3
Deaf and semi-deaf	2
Crippled	2
Physically defective	12
Psychopathic	2
Delinquent	4
Speech defective	3
Mentally deficient	12
Total number per 1,000	40

This estimate, of course, does not include pre-school children or those in need of special care by reason of dependency, neglect or illegitimacy. Similar estimates of children physically or mentally defective, and hence in need of special care, have already been given in the chapter on Child Health. The Children's Bureau estimated, in 1919, that in the United States each year at least 32,000 white children are born out of wedlock, and, in general, these, too, would come under the classification of being in need of special care. The Children's Bureau also

estimates that the number of children in need of aid through mothers' pensions, on the basis of the proportion aided in communities where assistance seems to be fairly adequate and inclusive, is from 350,000 to 400,000.

Child Census and Surveys Necessary

Clearly such estimates are unsatisfactory, even though they give an idea of the problem, simply because they are only estimates, and we do not really know either how many such children there are, or that they are receiving any special care. Ideally, the school census would show these children to a community, but a school census is often very carelessly taken and is not primarily concerned with the recording of children in need of special care. Dependent and delinquent children, in the natural course of events, usually come to somebody's attention—though that somebody may not be in the least qualified for their care. In the country, for instance, dependent and delinquent children are usually looked after by their neighbors and friends, who simply do the best they can, and who, incidentally, are usually far more ready than city people to give very practical aid to a child in need. But the physically or mentally handicapped child has a smaller chance of discovery. Even communities with a regular school census are astonished when a health or mental survey is instituted to discover the number of defective children in their midst who have received no special care at all. Such surveys are the necessary beginning of any adequate community care of children, and a careful school census that looks for such children is essential to their continued care.

Dependent Children

If the cause of child dependency and neglect were poverty alone, the ancient practice of giving alms might be more effective than it is. But poverty itself may come from so many social and economic causes that we all know very well that, while the giving of money and food and clothing to poor families is good and necessary and to be encouraged, there is nothing permanent about it, and something far more fundamental must be our ultimate concern. Low wages, unemployment, ill health or inefficiency; ignorance, low mentality, alcoholism, immorality or adult delinquency; death, divorce, desertion or illegitimacy, may all operate to make an abnormal home and a child in need of care, and not only the alleviation, but the removal of such conditions, as far as possible, is the final concern of the child welfare worker. He may not be able to change the conditions in the large, but he hopes to do so in each case, and when a dependent child comes to his attention, his first question is, "How can we make this home able and fit to care for its own child?" —because he knows that home is the place for a child. And if the child's home has been completely disrupted by death or other finality, he asks, "Where can we find the nearest approach to a normal home for this child, who needs a home because he is a child?"

Snap judgments cannot answer those questions. They call for careful study and specialized knowledge of conditions and ways and means. It may be a slow process during which temporary expedients are necessary, but to be permanent and socially effective it must be thorough.

And beyond this, the community must go into really preventive measures which will reduce the possibilities of disrupted or abnormal homes. It may seem to be a far cry from a community health campaign, sanitary and housing reform, the reduction of unemployment, or even a recreational campaign, to the care of neglected or dependent children, yet it takes no great knowledge of social principles to see the connection between healthy, efficient, self-supporting adults, and better homes for children. On the spiritual and moral side, the connection is equally close, though many churches have failed to see it. We cannot expect a very high type of moral development to come from crowded, unhealthy homes that are continually battling against poverty, disease and complete submergence in them.

Mothers' Pensions

Mothers' pensions originated in a reaction against institutional care of children and have grown with the desire to keep individual homes intact. The first mothers' pensions laws were passed in 1911, and by the end of 1921, forty states, Alaska, and Hawaii, had such laws, in spite of the early protests against them by the advocates of private rather than public relief. Actually, public relief for children in their own homes had been operative in several states long before 1911, and it has spread steadily with the growth of the ideas of state responsibility for children and of the wisdom of keeping children, whenever possible, in their own homes. Originally, the mothers' pensions laws applied only to widows, and six of the forty states now having such laws still give this aid to widows only, but the tendency is to broaden the scope of such

relief, and in some cases to take in even relatives other than parents and guardians.

There is no doubt that the principle of such relief is right, but the truth is that in administration, scope and amount granted, the laws are far from effective. In some cases relief is given only when the father is dead or incapacitated. In others a divorced or deserted mother may receive aid; in still others, any mother who is "needy" or is dependent on her own earnings for the support of her children. In some states, residence in the county or state is required for from five years to eighteen months. In others, only citizenship in the United States is required, while in still others, there is no residence or citizenship requirement. Aid is given only for children under fourteen years of age in nine states; under thirteen, in one; and to ages ranging from fifteen to eighteen (in cases of sickness or incapacity) in the others. The amount granted has, from the start, been recognized as usually too little, and the appropriations for aid have often been so small as to limit the number of families helped, without any regard for the number actually in need. In fact, the appropriations and individual grants have usually been fixed without any real knowledge of the amounts necessary. The maximum grants for three dependent children in their own homes are $19 to $20 a month in seven states; $22 to $29, in nine states; $30 to $39, in eight states; $40 to $49, in four states; and $50 to $59 in four, according to Emma Lundberg, of the Children's Bureau. Yet the amounts paid by private agencies for the care of three children in boarding-homes, in 1920, averaged about $60 a month. And, although such small grants necessarily mean wage-earning by the mother, in

two states and one large city where statistics as to the ages of children aided are kept, three fourths of the children were below school age, and 34 per cent of them under six, so that they actually required much more attention than a wage-earning mother can give.

If mothers' pensions are really to serve their purpose, it is clear that their administration must be along the lines of good social case-work, and the appropriations and grants must take into consideration both the numbers of families in need and the cost of child care in the various states and communities. Also, the age limits for children receiving aid must correspond with the state school and child labor laws, unless hardship and confusion are to result, for it is scarcely intelligent to limit aid to children under fourteen years old, and at the same time require the children to attend school, without wage-earning, until they are fifteen or sixteen, unless they have passed certain grades in school.

Placing-Out

Foster homes and boarding-homes are used to a greater and greater extent all over the country, for dependent, neglected or even delinquent and defective children, and as the "Minimum Standards" say, "To a much larger degree than at present, family homes may be used to advantage in the care of special classes of children." Technically, as the social worker uses the terms, "placing-out" and "boarding-out" are two different things, since placing-out means placing a child in a free family home of which he becomes a member. This does not necessarily imply adoption, although that legal act may follow after a period of trial—for both family and child. But

the fundamental principle of giving each child normal home care is the same in all these cases. There are thousands of homes ready to take in children, and thousands of children in need of homes, yet the placing of children is very easily abused, unless controlled and supervised.

The following are definite principles of child-placing which are recognized in the best child welfare work everywhere:

Before a child is placed in other than a temporary foster home, adequate consideration should be given to his health, mentality, character and family history and circumstances. Remediable physical defects should be corrected.

Complete records of every child under care are necessary to a proper understanding of the child's heredity, development and progress while under the care of the agency.

Careful and wise investigation of foster homes is prerequisite to the placing of children. Adequate standards should be required of the foster families as to character, intelligence, experience, training, ability, income and environment.

A complete record should be kept of each foster home, giving the information on which approval was based. The records should also show the agent's contacts with the family from time to time, for the purpose of indicating the care it gave to the child entrusted to it. In this way, special abilities in the families will be developed and conserved for the children.

Supervision of children placed in foster homes should include adequate visits by properly qualified and trained visitors and constant watchfulness over the child's health, education, and moral and spiritual development. Supervision is not a substitute for the responsibilities which properly rest with the foster family.

It is, of course, futile to set up standards for a foster home that are higher than our average standard of living allows. On the other hand, it is equally futile to fix the standards too low, or to have no standards, if our aim is to improve the condition of the children. "Persons

who desire a child for the child's sake," and not for the work he will do, are the ideal foster parents, regardless of their economic status. Yet they must have an income, of reasonable steadiness, that will provide care for the child. And they must understand the need for education, recreation and spiritual development for the child. They should have a good position in the opinion of their neighbors and fellow-citizens, and consequently, references should be given. The idea that any home that receives a child is a good home is, of course, false, and the supervision *after* placing-out is essential to proving that the home is good for the child, and that the child is not too much for the home. The State Charities Aid Association of New York has a careful system of "visits" to placed-out children wherever they may be, and continues supervision until the children are of age. Their records of the happy and constructive results of such placing-out would be astonishing to the people who still believe that the only way of caring for a dependent child is to place him in an institution.

Illegitimate Children

"The child of illegitimate birth," say the "Minimum Standards," "represents a very serious condition of neglect, and for this reason special safeguards should be provided for these children." The attempts of society to prevent illegitimacy have, in the past, resulted in actual deprivation of their rights of children born out of wedlock. Not only has the mother been an object of social punishment, but the child has been stigmatized and, consequently, hidden away in an institution or regarded as one who does not deserve the privileges of other children. Modern

legislation and modern child care, however, look upon such children as innocent victims of a situation and as, by reason of the situation, actually in need of much more protection and care than the child born in wedlock. For there are real hazards of illegitimacy. In the first place, the illegitimate child is usually without parental care. His father is seldom held financially responsible for him, and he is often separated from his mother from babyhood. The fact that so many illegitimate children are taken from their mothers in infancy, or have only poor care, results in the high rate of infant mortality among illegitimate children—two or three times as high as the rate for legitimate children. Moreover, the illegitimate suffers from hereditary handicaps. Feeble-mindedness, insanity, venereal disease, alcoholism, may and often do enter into his heredity. His environment is usually one of poverty and ignorance, not conducive to the care of the mental or physical defects he may have, or to the development of his moral sense. To punish such a child for the social crime of his parents, by neglecting him in his great need, is a mistake that society can ill afford. A model law for the protection of such children was drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1921, which provides that both father and mother shall be responsible for the child during minority; that the father's obligation, when established or acknowledged, is enforceable against his estate; that all agreements or compromises are binding only when full provision for the child is thereby secured and approved by a court having jurisdiction. The Children's Bureau's Standards of Legal Protection for Children Born Out of Wedlock provide, in addition, that all births should be registered, and all

births not clearly legitimate should be reported to a public agency responsible for child welfare; that proceedings to establish paternity should be begun by the mother or the public agency, and should be as informal and private as possible within the court used; that settlements out of court should be invalid unless approved; that whenever possible, the mother should keep her child during the nursing period at least; and that the duty of the state to protect such children should be recognized and exercised through the state child welfare departments, which should control the adoption or placing of the child and should license all hospitals receiving unmarried mothers and all child-helping and child-placing agencies.

Defective Children

With the development of child-care in family homes, it is natural that the public school should take over much of the welfare work with special classes of children. School mental and health clinics; classes for blind, deaf and crippled children; visiting teachers to go into homes and aid in the care of children; special truant and probation schools for delinquents; and physical training and recreation facilities, not only for normal children, but for special classes, are all known and effective measures of child welfare in our larger and more progressive schools. Professor Arnold Gesell said, in a report to the Connecticut Commission on Child Welfare in 1921, "It is sometimes argued that the business of the public school is to teach the so-called statutory subjects like reading, writing and arithmetic, and it is asked, 'Should not the public school exclude children so handicapped that they cannot benefit by ordinary instruction?' Legislation of the last quarter

of a century, both in Europe and this country, has answered this question emphatically in the negative. The practice of exclusion is out of sympathy with the democratic spirit of the public school. Exclusion cannot develop into a constructive policy. It leads nowhere. The public school system is, therefore, steadily shouldering the burden of defective and handicapped children. This is true in England and Canada as well as in progressive states and cities in this country. Cleveland, for example, has special classes, special schools, or auxiliary teachers for practically every type of handicapped child mentioned in our classification,—blind, deaf, crippled, incorrigible, speech defective, tuberculous, feeble-minded, etc. Similar provisions are found in representative cities like Boston, New York, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Los Angeles, etc. Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New York, Minnesota, have all passed far-reaching laws providing for public school care of the main types of defectives jointly under local and state auspices. . . . It is unnecessary to go to extremes and to contend that special state institutions for defective and handicapped children are to be systematically discouraged. Such institutions have an important work in the care of those cases which, for practical reasons, cannot be reached in any other way, but as a matter of public economy and public policy, we should do everything we reasonably can to keep certain types of defective children near their fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters."

Public school care of defective children is actually more economical than institutional care, in spite of the extra personnel and equipment it requires. The cost per pupil of education in a public school class for the blind, Dr.

Gesell says, is less than half of the cost per pupil in an institution. Moreover, the fact that public schools are more and more frequently provided with medical inspection and clinics, with school nurses for the care of all school children makes the use of the school for the defective child the more safe and economical. And as Dr. Gesell has pointed out, such care, not only does away with unnecessary institutional segregation, but fosters local responsibility toward the children and community control of social problems. The community that gives, through local agencies like the school, the two things that defective or handicapped children should have,—remedial care for their defects and the special type of constructive education suited to them while they remain in their own home, —has gone a long way toward the production of good, efficient citizens for itself and for the State.

"It is difficult for the feeble-minded to learn," says Dr. Walter Fernald. "Our psychological friends have told us it is equally difficult for them to forget. If we get the defective at an early age and bring him to manhood with good habits and keep him from bad associations, he will, in all probability, settle down and continue those good habits for the rest of his life. If, on the contrary, we allow that defective to roam about and to be influenced indiscriminately—and he is very easily influenced, because he is suggestible—if we allow him to have bad associations and to get into bad habits, it is impossible for us to remove those bad habits."

And again, "There is no panacea for feeble-mindedness. There will always be mentally defective persons in the population of every state and country. All our experience in dealing with the feeble-minded indicates that if

we are adequately to manage the defective, we must recognize his condition while he is a child, and protect him from evil influences, train and educate him according to his capacity, make him industrially efficient, teach him to acquire certain habits of living, and when he has reached adult life, continue to give him the friendly help and guidance he needs. These advantages should be accessible to every feeble-minded person in the State. Most important of all, so far as possible the hereditary class of defectives must not be allowed to perpetuate their decadent stock. The program for meeting the needs of these highly varied and heterogeneous groups must be as flexible and complex as the problem itself. It will be modified and developed as our knowledge and experience increases."

Give a mental defective the right care and environment, and he may become a useful citizen. Give him the wrong care, or no care, and he will be the opposite. Twenty-five per cent, or more, of the inmates of penal and correctional institutions are feeble-minded—evidences of what lack of care can do. For although we have long had institutions for the feeble-minded, it is only recently that we have emphasized the need of discovering and controlling *all* the mental defectives in a community, and those likely to suffer mental or moral breakdown because of psychopathic conditions, and of discovering them while they are children.

There are many varieties of mental defects and disorders. There is the hereditary class of feeble-minded; there are imbeciles, idiots and morons. There are also children mentally retarded for some reason, but who are not feeble-minded. There are psychopathic children with

"behavior difficulties." The popular mind, when such cases are discovered in mental clinics, is apt to lump them all in one class. But the only thing that binds them together is the fact that they all need treatment and care, though the kind of care naturally varies. The fact that such children often do not get the care they need comes out daily in juvenile courts, opportunity schools, child protective societies and even in neighborhood troubles with a "wild" boy or girl.

Even when the extreme cases of mental deficiency have been removed from a school, there always remain children who are, on this mental side, in need of special care. In a recent survey of 5,000 Cincinnati school children, it was found that 2 per cent were feeble-minded, 2 per cent were on the borderline of mental defect, 3.5 per cent were nervous or psychopathic, 4.8 per cent were sub-normal, .2 per cent suffered from epilepsy, .7 per cent from endocrine disorders, and 6 per cent "showed marked conduct disorders." The Mental Hygiene Council says of these children that "they are not only difficult problems for the school authorities today, but, if not properly diagnosed, given suitable medical and psychiatric treatment, educational training and (in the case of those needing it) kindly and friendly oversight and supervision, the great majority are destined later on in life to social failure and mental breakdown . . . thus to provide our public authorities and private agencies with their unimprovable cases of dependency, delinquency and insanity—conditions which are already costing the community millions of dollars."

Mental examinations are not necessary for the children who are clearly normal in school work and in behavior.

But they are extremely necessary for children seriously retarded in school, for delinquents, and for all children who are "problem cases." And after the examination, the right treatment and education must be provided. Most children, even of the moron class, can be well cared for at home and educated in the special class at school. Some children must necessarily be placed in institutions, although it is quite probable that a child placed early enough under the right care will eventually take a fairly normal place in his home and community. Dr. Fernald says of the program for the care of mental defectives that, at present it should include "the mental examination of backward school children; the mental clinic; the traveling clinic; the special class; directed training of individual defectives in country schools; instruction of parents of defective children; after-care of special-class pupils; special training of teachers in Normal schools; census and registration of the feeble-minded; extra-institutional supervision of all uncared-for defectives in the community; selection of the defectives who most need segregation for institutional care; increased institutional facilities; parole for suitable institutionally-trained adults; permanent segregation for those who need segregation; mental examinations of persons accused of crime, and of all inmates of penal institutions; and long-continued segregation of defective delinquents in special institutions."

Delinquent Children

The child delinquent is considered today, or should be considered, not as a criminal, but as a child suffering from maladjustment to the social scheme, and in need of special

child care. The juvenile court is interested, not in the offense the child has committed, save as it expresses the maladjustment, and not in "punishment," but in discovering the cause of the delinquency and removing it, or treating it.

Charles L. Chute, of the National Probation Association, says, "In this court, the question of guilt or innocence as to a particular act or acts is wholly subordinated, as it should be, to an examination of the character and condition of the child referred for attention. Its underlying conception and dominant practice is to ascertain the individual and social causes of the delinquency and to remove or counteract them. It is not interested in punishment as such. Its purpose is to understand, in order that it may be able to cure and prevent. The children's court works entirely through the individual study and treatment of each child. Properly conceived, its work is analogous and, in fact, closely related to that of the physician. In its study of the individual child, before a diagnosis is reached, it employs the psychiatric clinic, the psychologist, and the trained social investigator, usually known as the probation officer. In its treatment it utilizes all the helpful and preventive agencies of the community, under skilled direction of the probation staff." In short, the juvenile court is engaged in turning a community "problem" or menace into a community asset—a socially adjusted child.

Probation

"Probation, as it relates to children, may be defined as a system of treatment for the delinquent child or, in the case of the neglected or destitute child, for delinquent

parents, by means of which the child and parents remain in their ordinary environment and, to a great extent, at liberty; but, throughout a probation period, subject to the watchful care and personal influence of an agent of the court known as the probation officer." Probation did not originate as a means of treating delinquent children, but in the criminal courts, as a humane and constructive method of handling any delinquent without imprisonment or segregation. But it developed principally in the care of children before the courts and is, in the juvenile court, "not a separate feature or branch of the court's work merely, but an integral and vital part of it; in fact, the children's court operates through the work of its probation officers, and without it could hardly exist."

Probation officers are both investigators and supervisors. They make thorough investigations of individuals and families before the court, attend the hearings of their cases or report before such hearings, and supervise the children placed on probation. As an adjunct to their study of each case, in the best modern practice, there is the court clinic, which studies each child through physical, psychological and psychiatric examinations. This has been developed because of the discovery that so many child delinquents are suffering from some physical or mental defect or abnormality which must be diagnosed and treated in the disposition of the case.

Supervision under probation means a close personal relation between the officer and the child and his family. The child reports to the officer, and the officer visits the child. He takes the closest interest in the way the child lives. He may see to it that the child goes to church or Sunday school. He may provide recreation for the child,

or join in it. He may help the child's family to live better and more wisely. He may take an interest in the child's school work. He may find the right sort of employment for the child. But whatever the details of his supervision, his interest is in a better and fuller life for the child.

Juvenile Court Standards

The juvenile court is not only separate from the adult one, but it is different. One of its first principles is that the child shall be saved from contact with older offenders, and shall, therefore, neither be committed to an institution with older offenders, nor held in a jail with them, pending treatment. This means that in connection with the court there are detention or boarding-homes for the juvenile delinquents who must be taken from their own homes before or during the court proceedings. A second principle of the court is that all hearings shall be private, personal and completely without publicity. The judge, according to C. C. Carstens of the Child Welfare League of America, must have "a deep and abiding interest in the care and protection of children and in the improvement of his fellow-men. . . . If the judge has not the time for the stupidest parent and patience with the meanest youngster, he is probably out of place on the juvenile court bench. For this reason, the juvenile court work should take a considerable part of the time that the judge spends on the bench, so that the services of the juvenile court may become his major interest." Beyond this, the court must have the investigative and supervisory staff necessary to the probation system, and a medical and psychological clinic, either attached to it or available in

the school or other local agency. And it must be on close terms of cooperation with all the public and private child welfare agencies and institutions of the community so as to utilize them and assist them.

Juvenile Courts as They Are

Very few juvenile courts come up to all these specifications. Many people still think of the juvenile court as exactly like an adult court in practice and function, except that it handles children's cases, and many judges actually handle the cases much as if they were of adults. The idea that a child has committed a crime, of free will and because of inherently bad character, which nothing but severe punishment can expiate, still lingers in many a judicial and lay mind which fails to see the relation of environment and training to a child's behavior, present and future. And the result is, of course, a failure of the court to do what is expected of it.

In one state, for instance, where there is a juvenile court law specifically stating that no child under fourteen shall be committed to a jail or any place where he can come in contact with adult criminals, it was found that in 1918, 22 children from one county were sent to the workhouse, "a sort of half-way station between the detention home and the house of reform"; 105 children from 21 counties were sent to the house of reform, where later the grand jury recommended that the governor either pardon or transfer to the state penitentiary at least 150 white men and 50 colored who had no place in a corrective school for children; 9 children were committed to county jails, 3 of them having been transferred as "felons" from the county to the circuit court; 77 chil-

dren were fined and 55 of them, being unable to pay their fines, were imprisoned in the county jail. In another state a judge stated that in one year he had sent 65 children to jail, 40 to a chain gang, 12 to a reformatory, 1 to an orphanage, and had fined 156. In other states, one method of "saving a child" is whipping.

As a matter of fact, although there are juvenile court laws in almost every state (46 in 1921), the courts are not as widespread as we usually think they are. In 1920 the Children's Bureau reported that only 321 "specially organized" children's courts existed in the whole country. They are usually established only in the larger cities. In the rural districts or even smaller cities they are practically unknown. And where they do not exist, the children, of course, receive the most haphazard or even positively destructive treatment.

Such lack of care for children comes, primarily, from ignorance on the part of the community of the need of care. That it also comes from lack of knowledge of existing conditions by people of the highest ideals is suggested by an instance given in *Rural Child Welfare*. "In another rural county where we inquired about the holding of children in jail, the probation officer, the Red Cross President and a local children's agent for the state, all reported that no juveniles were ever kept there. One active in civic and religious interests in the city emphasized his reply with: 'We wouldn't think of such a thing.' The writer went direct from his office to the jail and found two boys, one sixteen, who had been there five weeks, and one eleven, who had been there three weeks, and with the help of the sheriff took from the jail register the names of six additional juveniles admitted within a

period of twelve months. The local workers were without doubt sincere, but they just had not known and had not thought of finding out for themselves. . . . Through the courtesy of the jailer, who said he had no idea how many juveniles they had had in a year but acknowledged that it was a large number, we found twenty-six under eighteen years registered during a twelve-month period. They included six children aged eleven, three of whom were repeaters as many as four times; four aged twelve and thirteen, with one three times a repeater; eight aged fourteen and fifteen; and four aged sixteen and seventeen, all repeaters. Two of the four whose ages were not recorded were four times repeaters. . . . A jail is no place for a child; it breeds criminals."

The Meaning of It All

"The ultimate consumer pays the bill." In this case, it is the public that pays the price. There are only two bills to pay: one which remedies the situation, the other which pays the price for not remedying it. Until rather recently, the public chose, perhaps unconsciously, the second procedure. It was "cheaper" to neglect a club-footed boy than it was to operate on him. It was "easier" to let a blind boy hang around the house and neglect fitting him for earning a livelihood. It was "just what he deserved" to send a boy guilty of petty larceny to a reform school. It was "all foolishness" to take children out of institutions where they could be handled economically and uniformly and place them in homes. It was "outraging the community" to legitimatize the illegitimate.

The public simply did not know. Individually, it had its pity, its sympathy and its prejudices. Collectively, it

offered nothing. It has paid the price. Insane asylums, prisons, reformatories, relief organizations and institutions are the bills. There is clear evidence that our prisons are filled with men who were once boy-delinquents. These boy-delinquents, in very many cases, were illegitimate or orphaned, or from a home of strife, poverty or disease. "They started early a life of crime" is not as accurate a statement as saying "that the conditions within them and around them gave them a handicap in living a normal childhood."

There is clear evidence that physically handicapped persons, in many cases, can have their handicap removed or overcome. It has been proved that medical treatments and vocational training have made these people self-supporting, and that liabilities have been turned into assets. Over and over again, the children's court, probationary measures, "Big Brother" movements—and all devices for making children in need of special care an *individual affair*—have proved that it is cheaper to put a lock on the barn door before the horse is stolen than it is to buy a new horse.

Prejudice, ignorance, tradition and lack of understanding have kept us from purchasing the lock. As a result, society has had its defective, delinquent, handicapped, illegitimate and orphaned children stolen from their birthright "the treatment that you would want for your own child" and has paid the price in its adult institutions of asylums, prisons and relief.

"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"—only here, literally, there is no cure except through prevention.

VIII

The Child and the Church

The little church of my childhood on the prairie stood across the road from the schoolhouse, and there were other churches, Catholic, Lutheran, Methodist, not far away which, with this one, ministered to practically all the children within a radius of three or four miles. The Bible was not read regularly, if it was read at all, in the school, but every child, Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran or Methodist, had instruction in the Bible by parent, preacher or Sunday school teacher. And I am thinking that what existed there in that primitive community should, for the integrity of our life, be made possible under the changed and heterogeneous social conditions which now obtain. With our varying creeds, the religious teacher may not come with his or her particular creed into the school, but that should not prevent a cooperation between school and church or between school and home which will insure the religious teaching of every child outside the school. The time has come for Protestant and Catholic and Jew and Gentile to cooperate to the end that every child may have what, in practice, every child in that prairie community had, an intimation, at least, of his moral and religious inheritance. We should go as far as our common creeds will let us in our moral and ethical teaching in the schools of our common preparation for democracy's obligation. The boundaries between ethics and religion are not clearly marked. But where that zone is reached, the Church and the home must lead the

soul of the child, and if the State have an obligation, it is only to see that no child is neglected.

Facing this problem, when I was Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, I made three suggestions (in 1917) at a great interdenominational meeting in Carnegie Hall, where Catholics, Jews and Protestants alike were represented:

1. The preparation of a book of selections from the Bible by an Interdenominational Commission appointed by the Legislature or the Board of Regents for use in the schools (since the compulsion to read, without comment, a prescribed number of verses from the Bible each day, from one version or another, was certain to cause trouble in many communities and cause an ill-feeling that would offset any probable good).

2. The formulation of a plan for non-proselyting cooperation between the school and various denominations, to the end that every child should have both its democratical and its religious instruction during the school week.

3. The granting of Regents' credits for serious work in Bible study, whether inside or outside of the public schools.

But what I proposed looked at the problem only from the point of view of the public school and its responsibility, as well as its limitations. It is one which must be solved by the church and the home, the public school helping only as it may to give them their full opportunity. What that opportunity, with the attendant obligation, is, has been most succinctly and appealingly set forth in a book in the press at the time of this writing, by Walter Albion Squires, B.D., with an introduction by Harold

McA. Robinson, D.D. (published by the Westminster Press).[1] The following admirable summary presents both the problem and what I believe to be its solution:

1. There has been a constant change in the methods of religious education and in the agencies carrying on this task. We have not yet reached a satisfactory stopping point, but must go until we secure a system of religious education which will assure a true and efficient religious nurture for all children and young people of the nation.

2. The secularization of public education in America threw upon the churches a task of such magnitude and of such inherent difficulty that the churches have not yet adjusted themselves to the task so as to accomplish it efficiently. The problem must occupy our attention until a satisfactory solution is found.

3. The elimination of religious instruction from the public schools made necessary a system of church schools, in every way equal to the public schools in their efficiency as educational institutions, and reaching the childhood of the nation as extensively as it is reached by the public schools. The churches have failed to a lamentable degree in both requirements. They have not organized schools comparable with the public schools in educational efficiency, and they have not reached half as many children as the public schools have enrolled.

4. The elimination of religious instruction from the state-controlled schools, which most of the children of America attend, has put the states under obligation. They are in duty bound to cooperate with all religious bodies upon which the vastly important phases of education involved in religious nurture have been laid. They must not monopolize the child's time and leave to the cooperating agencies in the educational task only the fatigue time and the recreation time of the children.

5. If states maintain an attitude of antagonism toward church schools, they will defeat their own aims, for there can be no true education which neglects the culture of the religious instincts, neither is there safety for any state or any civilization built on

[1] *A New Program of Religious Education for the Individual Church.*

an educational foundation from which religion has been eliminated.

6. We have found no way of giving adequate religious instruction as a part of the public-school curriculum in a democracy like ours, and it seems questionable whether any system of the kind can be devised without seriously disarranging the fundamental principles on which our nation has been erected.

7. For the religious bodies of our land to create parochial schools sufficient to care for their children would entail an enormous expense and would tend to destroy our public school system. The public schools are the corner stone of our national structure; therefore, an extensive system of parochial schools is not the solution of our problem.

8. The solution of our problems evidently lies in a twofold school system; first of all, a public-school system, giving to all the children of America that fundamental educational culture in mind and morals which makes a foundation for good citizenship; and, likewise, a church-school system, reaching all the children of America with that religious nurture which is even more necessary for righteous living and neighborliness than anything the public schools, under our system of government, can teach.

9. The creation of a church-school system which shall be the peer of our splendid public-school system is the most important problem of our land to-day. Three hundred years of development and experimentation have led us to the place where we are face to face with this problem. We cannot longer delay an earnest effort to solve it.

10. Since religious instruction is an indispensable part of any right educational system, and necessary to the maintenance of our system of government, all good citizens of the nation ought to be willing to support the church schools as generously as is necessary to put them on an equality with our public schools.

It will be agreed by those who give serious thought to the subject of spiritual things, that an "educational ministry to childhood is the most important task of the individual church." But how lamentably short of meeting

its obligation to the child—of paying the eternal debt of maturity—the church falls! I should not dare, out of my own experience, to say what Mr. Squires has said in the book referred to above—that "the teaching program of the Protestant church has been an approximate failure"; but it is undoubtedly true when we compare the accomplishments with "the whole task intended by the Sunday school and other educational agencies of the church. But how meager the time that is set apart for this great task! How meager is the available teaching force! How meager is the provision for the training of the teachers! How meager is the equipment for it all at best! And how meager is the amount that the church puts into it! If we believe that the chief end of man is spiritual development, how can we be satisfied with this program of meagerness!

There is a movement throughout the churches which shows that they are not content to go on with this meager program. Not only are the individual denominations stirring within themselves, but they are cooperating, uniting with one another, in paying the debt which, individually and collectively, they owe to childhood.

What that adequate program is cannot here be set forth in any detail, but it will include the Sunday school, —the Sunday school with suitable standards based upon the collected and compared experiences of thousands of teachers,—as only one part of a unified plan, which will contain these features:

1. Week-day religious instruction (the public school must cooperate with the home and the church by yielding a portion of the school week that children may receive religious instruction under favorable conditions).

2. Vacation Church schools (in which instruction in religious matters can be given on consecutive days for a considerable period).

3. Correlation of the church educational program with that of the public schools.

4. Interdenominational cooperation in training of teachers and in dealing with community problems relating to childhood.

5. Parents' classes to reach the spiritual life of the home, and so to surround the child with influences that make for the best things of human life. It is summed up for us in this paragraph:

"The goal for which we strive would, therefore, seem to be a national system of religious education in which each church gives the spiritual nurture of children a place in its activities commensurate with its importance, and in which there is interchurch and interdenominational cooperation in such parts of the religious educational task as can be assigned with profit to such cooperative effort."

The Price of It All

The amount of this debt eternal is suggested by the preciousness of the wisdom which the Church is seeking to find and to give to its children.

In the memorable dramatic debate following the series of disasters—which were world disasters in 1520 B.C.—which left Job's wide-stretching fields out beyond Jordan—where I was just at the close of the war—like a bit of "No Man's Land" in France, Job sat, covered with sores, on something worse than a garbage heap, amid the ashes of his sorrow, while three friends came with august phrase and condemning philosophy to "bemoan and to

comfort him"; Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the Naamathite. Was ever such platform as this one, out upon the far horizon of time, and ever such convocation as that which there culminated in the human eloquence of Elihu the Buzite, leading them all into the presence of the wondrous works of God and into the hearing of His voice!

In this high debate—"the greatest poem in the world's greatest literature," as it has been called by the highest of critics—there was, despite the fresh economic disasters and the painful distemper, no reference to the cost of living, save in Job's remembering longingly other days when butter and oil and other necessities of life were abundant and cheap, as is intimated by the figure of his lamentation:

> Oh that I were as in months past . . . when I washed my steps with butter, and the rock poured me out rivers of oil!

The only economic reference, so far as I can find, was to the high price or value of wisdom, as intimated and iterated by Job in those jewelled verses, rich in oriental metaphor:

> It cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof.
>
> It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx or the sapphire.
>
> No mention shall be made of coral or of pearls, for the price of wisdom is above rubies.

It was not a Red Cross Commission assembled there, such as that of which I was a member out near the land of Uz, discussing practical ways and means to give relief to Job's physical need or to rid him of his malady (and I saw thousands out there with a similar malady,

the boil upon the face). It was not a commission such as that of which I was once a member in my own state, to consider how prices of living might be reduced. No, it was a council in the midst of devastation and disease and death for the philosophical discussion of the mystery of suffering here upon the earth and of the price of wisdom and the place of understanding—a discussion out of which rise the famous lines as to values, which I have quoted. These lines intimate the "fair price" of wisdom, as appraised by a self-appointed committee, sitting on an ash mound, near the edge of the desert, in a civilization which we are prone to condemn in our automobilic and electric-lighted age.

In this curriculum of Man's achievements, which may be interpreted to be the sciences and arts of the sixteenth century, B.C., it is said, in summary, by Job, that:

Man has taken iron out of the earth,
He has melted brass from the stone,
He has found the dust of gold,
He has devised a way of ending darkness,
He has made a shaft,
He has gotten bread out of the earth,
He has swung suspended afar from men,
He has hewed at the roots of the mountains,
He has searched for stones in darkness,
He has carved the flint,
He has cleft the rock,
He has bound the stream from overflowing,
He has seen every precious thing,
He has searched into the shadows of death,
He has brought the hidden to light.

And after reference, already quoted, as to the tuition fees, he goes on to mention still other courses which then transcended man's knowledge but have since been brought within his reach:

> The weighing of winds (meteorology),
> The measuring of waters (hydrostatics),
> The utilizing and so the controlling of rainfall (irrigation),
> The directing of the ways of lightning (the telegraph and telephone),
> The looking to the ends of the earth (aeronautics).

And in the midst of this eloquent recital, there rises, like the wail of a Greek chorus, the interrupting question: "But where is wisdom to be found, and where is the place of understanding?"

Job answers: "Man knoweth not the price thereof." And as to the place or the places, "The sea saith it is not with me; . . . neither is it found in the land of the living."

. . . . . .

The world is sitting as Job today, covered with sores, shorn of billions upon billions of its possessions, bereft of millions upon millions of its sons—sitting in the ashes of its losses and its sorrows, bewildered as to the meaning of this Satanic visitation. The first and natural practical thought is of economic repair, of rehabilitation, of forced reparation by the Teutonic Sabeans and the Chaldeans who still dwell in this world. But it is most encouraging that among those gathered about the earth in its losses and sufferings to "bemoan it and to comfort it," there rises the counsel of Job, the glorification of education,

whose value is "above all rubies" and whose path the "birds of prey" and "proud beasts" have not seen or trodden, the path (for the place of wisdom is as a path) leading to the good of mankind through the fear of God, and to cosmic happiness through departure from evil.

When I again reached America, whose splendid practical idealism I had heard praised all the way by which civilization had traveled to our coasts, from the Gates of the Garden of Eden, I had hoped to find this beloved land of mine aflame with that same spirit which would be saying in peace what it had said during the War: "We are ready to spend everything that we *are* and everything that we *have*" for that which will exalt our nation, that it may continue to bless the earth, and to bless the earth above all others. Being a schoolmaster, I thought first of the school. I remembered specifically what Job said at the education conference to which I have referred (in the sixteenth century B.C.) as to the value of wisdom, and I hoped that democracy was going to be ready to pay the price, even though it might be above rubies.

I was rejoiced, a few days after my return, that my own state took a long step in this direction by doubling its contribution toward teachers' salaries, and I had, the next year, the surpassing satisfaction of seeing the state add $20,000,000 to the salaries of its teachers. But splendid as this all is, it will not satisfy all the needs of our children, unless it also bring them into the "place of understanding" which is "departure from evil," into that wisdom which is godliness.

I find myself in entire agreement with Dr. Walter S. Athearn, professor of religious education in Boston University, that the greatest educational task before the

American people today is the "building of a system of religious education which will insure the religious development of every citizen in the teaching of that wisdom which is godliness." The best minds of the nations are working at the problem of secular education, and with 500,000 teachers giving their whole time to such teaching in the United States alone, there will be constant improvement in methods and progress in testing and developing the child mind. But for religious training, there is, unhappily, no such provision. It is stated on highest authority that there are 15,000,000 children who receive no religious guidance whatever; and few of the remaining millions have any serious progressive instruction in that which is the highest concern of humanity—the spiritual relationship of man to his Maker and to his fellow-men. To make this possible, it will be necessary to establish and nourish a system of church schools which will parallel the public schools all the way up from the kindergarten. The two must be coordinated. This is the most serious problem of the Protestant Church. Pioneer attempts have been made for the development of a system of religious training that will help the home to meet this sacred opportunity and obligation, and will supplement the home and the public school in the spiritual culture of the child. It is not to be found in a religious school system that relieves the parent of all responsibility, or that takes over the work of the public school, but that helps the parents to meet their spiritual obligations to their offspring, and correlates its instruction with that of democracy's common school. These pioneer plans for such correlation are set forth in Professor Athearn's *Religious Instruction*

and American Democracy and in Mr. Squires' book quoted above.

I heard one of the greatest of our physical chemists say a few days ago, that if the molecules in a glass of water were magnified so that each was as large as a grain of sand, there would be enough sand to make a road all the way from New York to Los Angeles three miles wide and seven hundred feet deep. If the lives of the children of America could be magnified merely to their spiritual capacities, what a miracle would be wrought in the life of America all the way from one side of the continent to the other—and yet no miracle, for it is within the range of the possible.

When we think of the billions who have lived upon this earth and have laid themselves down to die in its dust, never dreaming that we should come after them; when we become conscious that, of the nearly two billions upon the face of the earth today, swinging around under the same sun with us, only a few hundreds or thousands of whom, at most, know that we are on the same planet with them, and then when we reflect that after we have gone, billions and trillions will come, not one of whom, after a generation or two, will know that we have lived, loved, aspired, struggled here, we are likely to think that what one can do isn't worth while, that we are but "as snow upon the desert's dusty face, lasting one hour or two and gone." Then above such a hopeless counsel is heard the voice of the Great Teacher who asked that the nameless boy with the five barley loaves and two small fishes (the five ordinary senses and the two, often awkward, hands) be sent to him, and who so blest his store that it fed

thousands. The children's store is enough to feed the hungry world, if only it is blest with the spirit of Christ.

When at the end of one of the most memorable days of my life, having presided at a meeting at which I had introduced some of the most distinguished men of the day, a member of the President's cabinet, the Governor of the State, the Mayor of the City, President Eliot and Mr. Choate, I came to my home, clad in my academic robes, with a hood of brilliant color about my shoulders, three or four little boys playing near the door looked up in awe. At last one of them got his tongue and said, "There goes John's father." So at the end of all this day of glory, I was the father of my three-year-old boy. It is that great multitude whom he represents to me who are soon to possess this earth, and we cannot do more for them or for the promised land they are to enter than to prepare them for its spiritual as well as physical occupations.

I often recall, by contrast with this scene, an experience in the mountains—not of the South but of New York—where I had lost my way amid the snows. At last, coming in the early morning upon a shack at the side of the drifted road, and hearing the sound of some one stirring inside, I knocked and was asked to come in. Opening the door, I saw a lad, sore of face and almost bare of clothing. I asked him where the road led. He answered, "It don't lead nowhere. It just goes up here a little ways and stops." That is the picture of more lives than we wish to admit. They just go a little way—and stop. The great service of the Church, through its school, coordinated with the home and democracy's school, is to open the road for every child into the infinite.

H. G. Wells, in a book called *The Undying Fire,* tells of a schoolteacher who, having endured such trials in his day as Job in his, rehearses what he has done for his boys:

"My boys have learned the history of mankind so that it has become their own adventure."

"They have learned geography so that the world is their possession."

"I have had languages taught to make the past live again in their minds and to be windows upon the souls of alien peoples."

"Science has taken my boys into the secret places of matter and out among the nebulae."

"Some of my boys have already made good business men because they were more than business men."

"When the war came my boys were ready. They have gone to their deaths—how many have gone to their deaths!"

But after this recital, he rises to this golden sentence:

"And for the future, I simply want this world better taught, so that wherever the flame of God can be lit, it has been lit."

A Reading List

A Select Reading List

There can be listed here but a few of the vast number of books, pamphlets, and periodicals that have been published on the theme of this book. Those who wish to consult a wider range of sources than the titles noted will find the following lists useful:

1. Publications of the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Lists more than 100 pamphlets and special studies on many phases of child welfare. Free on request.
2. List of books and pamphlets on child welfare. Compiled by E. L. Bascom and D. M. Mendenhall. Wisconsin Library Commission, Madison, Wisconsin. 6 cents.
3. Selected list of books for parents. Federation for Child Study, 2 West 64th Street, New York. 25 cents.
4. List of Educational Panels and Publications of the National Child Welfare Association, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York. Bulletin 40. Free on request.
5. List of Publications of the National Child Labor Committee, 105 East 22nd Street, New York. Free on request.
6. The "American Home Series" of pamphlets. Edited by Norman E. Richardson. The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. List of pamphlets free on request.

The pamphlets deal with specific problems which parents face. Each pamphlet is devoted to a single subject. The material is entertainingly written and is suited to the needs of fathers and mothers. They vary in price from 15 to 25 cents.

GENERAL

American Charities. Revised Edition. AMOS G. WARNER. 1919. T. Y. Crowell Co., New York. $2.50.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, The. November, 1921, issue. JAMES H. BOSSARD, Editor. Academy of Political Science, Columbia University, New York. $1.00.

Character Training in Childhood. MARY S. HAVILAND. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston. $2.00. By mail, $2.15.

Childhood and Character. HUGH HARTSHORN. 1919. Pilgrim Press, Boston. $1.75.

Child Labor and the Constitution. RAYMOND G. FULLER. 1923. T. Y. Crowell Co., New York. $2.50.

Child Labor in the United States: Ten Questions Answered. Bulletin No. 114, Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Child Nature and Child Nurture. EDWARD PORTER ST. JOHN. Pilgrim Press, Boston. Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

Girlhood and Character. MARY MOXCEY. Abingdon Press, New York. $1.50.

Introduction to Child Psychology. CHARLES W. WADDLE. 1918. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. $2.00.

Meaning of Child Labor, The. RAYMOND G. FULLER. 1922. A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago. $1.00.

National System of Education, A. WALTER SCOTT ATHEARN. Missionary Education Movement, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. $1.50.

New Homes for Old. SOPHONISBA PRESTON BRECKINRIDGE. 1921. Harper and Brothers, New York. $2.50.

Problems of Child Welfare. GEORGE B. MANGOLD. 1914. The Macmillan Co., New York. $2.00.

Rural Child Welfare. EDWARD N. CLOPPER and others. 1922. The Macmillan Co., New York. $3.00.

Science of Power, The. BENJAMIN KIDD. 1918. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $1.50.

Social Work. EDWARD T. DEVINE. 1922. The Macmillan Co., New York. $3.00.

What Is Social Case Work? MARY E. RICHMOND. 1922. Russell Sage Foundation, New York. $1.00.

You Are the Hope of the World. HERMAN HAGEDORN. 1920. The Macmillan Co., New York. 80 cents.

Youth and the Race. EDGAR JAMES SWIFT. 1912. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $1.50.

THE FAMILY

Family as a Social and Educational Institution, The. WILLYSTINE GOODSELL. 1915. The Macmillan Co., New York. $2.00.

Mother-Teacher of Religion, The. ANNA FREELOVE BETTS. Abingdon Press, New York. $2.00. By mail, $2.20.

Religious Education in the Family. HENRY F. COPE. 1915. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. $1.50.

Religious Nurture of a Little Child, The. WILLIAM BYRON FORBUSH *and* FREDERICK W. LANGFORD. 1920. American Institute of Child Life, 1714 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. 20 cents.

Study of the Little Child, A. MARY THEODORA WHITLEY. 1921. Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 60 cents.

Training of Children in the Christian Family, The. LUTHER A. WEIGLE. 1922. Pilgrim Press, Boston. $1.50.

HEALTH

Bitter Cry of the Children. JOHN SPARGO. 1906. The Macmillan Co., New York. This book is out of print, but it is obtainable in most libraries.

Care and Feeding of Children. L. EMMET HOLT. 1909. D. Appleton & Co., New York. $1.25.

Child Health Study of New York State, A. Conducted by the Child Welfare Committee of the New York State League of Women Voters, 1625 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York. 15 cents.

Community Health Problem, The. ATHEL CAMPBELL BURNHAM. 1920. The Macmillan Co., New York. $1.50.

Food, Health and Growth. L. EMMET HOLT. 1922. The Macmillan Co., New York. $1.50.

Hygiene of the School Child, The. LEWIS MADISON TERMAN. 1914. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. $1.65.

New Public Health. HIBBERT WINSLOW HILL. 1916. The Macmillan Co., New York. $1.50.

Newer Knowledge of Nutrition, The. ELMER V. MCCOLLUM. 1923. The Macmillan Co., New York. A new and revised edition in preparation.

Nutrition and Growth in Children. WILLIAM R. P. EMERSON. 1922. D. Appleton & Co., New York. $2.50.

RECREATION

Boy Scouts of America. Edited by FRANKLIN K. MATHIEWS. 1922. D. Appleton & Co., New York. $2.50.

Church and the People's Play, The. HENRY A. ATKINSON. 1915. Pilgrim Press, Boston. $1.25.

Motion Picture Problem. CHARLES N. LATHROP. 1922. Committee on Church and Social Service, 105 East 22nd Street, New York. 15 cents.

Moving Pictures in the Church. ROY L. SMITH. 1921. Abingdon Press, New York. 35 cents.

Philosophy of Play. LUTHER H. GULICK. 1920. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $1.60.

Play Movement in the United States, The. CLARENCE E. RAINWATER. 1922. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. $2.75.

Popular Amusements. RICHARD HENRY EDWARDS. 1915. Association Press, New York. $1.25.

School in the Modern Church, The. HENRY F. COPE. 1919. George H. Doran Co., New York. $1.50.

A Select Reading List

Pamphlets published by the Playground and Recreation Association of America, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York:
(1) *Community Recreation.* 1919. 30 cents.
(2) *Comrades in Play.* 1920. 30 cents.
(3) *Pioneering for Play.* 1921. 30 cents.

DEPENDENCY AND DELINQUENCY

Care of the Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children, The. Homer Folks. 1902. The Macmillan Co., New York. $1.00.

Individual Delinquent, The. William Healy. 1915. Little Brown & Co., Boston. $5.00.

Juvenile Delinquency. Henry H. Goddard. 1921. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. $1.50.

Poverty and Dependency. J. L. Gillin. 1921. Century Co., New York. $4.00.

EDUCATION

Books for Boys and Girls. C. M. Hewins. 1915. American Library Association, 78 East Washington St., Chicago. 20 cents.

Consolidated Rural School, The. Louis W. Rapeer. 1920. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $3.00.

Consolidated Schools of the Mountains, Valleys, and Plains of Colorado. C. G. Sargent. Colorado Agricultural College Bulletin, June, 1921. Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Graded List of Books for Children. National Education Association of the United States. Library Department. Committee on Elementary School Libraries. 1922. American Library Association, 78 East Washington Street, Chicago. $1.25.

History of Education in the United States. Edwin Grant Dexter. 1904. The Macmillan Co., New York. $3.00.

New Program of Religious Education for the Individual Church, A. Walter Albion Squires. 1923. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.

Public Education in the United States. Ellwood P. Cubberley. 1919. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. $2.40.

Roads to Childhood; views and reviews of children's books. Annie Carroll Moore. 1920. George H. Doran Co., New York. $1.50.

Rural Child Welfare. Edward N. Clopper. The Macmillan Co., New York. $3.00.

Rural Education. O. G. Brim. 1923. The Macmillan Co., New York.
Rural Life. C. J. Galpin. 1918. Century Co., New York. $2.50.
Rural Teacher and His Work, The. H. W. Foght. 1920. The Macmillan Co., New York. $1.40.
Schools of Tomorrow. John and Evelyn Dewey. 1915. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. $1.50.
Selected List of Books for Children. 1919 . Federation for Child Study. 2 West 64th Street, New York. 50 cents. *Supplement* to above. 1921. 10 cents.
Successful Teaching in Rural Schools. M. S. Pittman. 1922. American Book Co., New York. $1.40.
Teaching Work of the Church, The. 1923. Association Press, New York.
Work of the Rural School, The. John D. Eggleston and Robert W. Bruère. Harper & Brothers, New York. $1.00.

RELIGIOUS NURTURE

Christian Citizenship for Girls. Helen Thoburn. 1922. The Womans Press, New York. Cloth, 55 cents; paper, 35 cents.
Evolution of the Sunday-School, The. Henry F. Cope. 1911. Pilgrim Press, Boston, 75 cents.
Handbook for Comrades. A program of Christian citizenship training for boys fifteen to seventeen years of age. 1920. Association Press, New York. 75 cents.
Handbook for Pioneers. A program of Christian citizenship training for boys twelve to fourteen years of age. 1919. Association Press, New York. 85 cents.
How to Organize a Daily Vacation Bible School. Albert H. Gage. 1922. Judson Press, Philadelphia. $1.50.
Missionary Education of Juniors. J. Gertrude Hutton. 1917. Missionary Education Movement, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. 60 cents. Order through denominational headquarters.
New Program of Religious Education, The. George Herbert Betts. 1921. Abingdon Press, New York. 75 cents.
Religious Education and American Democracy. Walter Scott Athearn. 1917. Pilgrim Press, Boston. $1.75.
School in the Modern Church, The. Henry F. Cope. 1919. George H. Doran Co., New York. $1.50.
Social Theory of Religious Education, A. George Albert Coe. 1917. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $1.50.
Week-day Church School, The. Henry F. Cope. 1921. George H. Doran Co., New York. $2.00.

SPECIAL GROUPS

American Indian on the New Trail, The. THOMAS C. MOFFETT. 1914. Missionary Education Movement, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents. Order through denominational headquarters.

Near Side of the Mexican Question, The. JAY S. STOWELL. 1921. George H. Doran Co., New York. $1.50.

Trend of the Races, The. GEORGE E. HAYNES. 1922. Missionary Education Movement, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents. Order through denominational headquarters.

PERIODICALS

American Child, The. Published quarterly by National Child Labor Committee, 105 East 22nd Street, New York. $2.00 per year.

Playground, The. A monthly magazine published by Playground and Recreation Association of America, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York. $2.00 per year.